UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
49th meeting
held on
Friday, 18 December 1992
at 6.30 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 49th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. DINU	(Romania)
later:	Ms. ROTHEISER (Vice-Chairman)	(Austria)
later:	Mr. DINU	(Romania)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.62 concerning agenda item 79

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75 concerning agenda item 78

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.46, A/C.2/47/L.47 and A/C.2/47/L.61 concerning agenda item 79

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/47/L.49 concerning agenda item 80

Revised estimates under section 38: Commission of Experts established pursuant to Security Council resolution 780 (1992)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58305 6566S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/47/SR.49
11 January 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.62 concerning agenda item 79 (A/C.5/47/78)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee would have the General Assembly convene in 1993, in accordance with the mandate agreed upon at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, an intergovernmental conference under United Nations auspices on straddling and highly migratory fish stocks. In his statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/47/78) the Secretary-General had estimated conference-servicing costs at $854,200 and non-conference-servicing costs at $194,600, making a total of $1,048,800. It was anticipated that savings would arise as a result of the shortening of the sessions of the Preparatory Commission for the International Seabed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, which should make it possible to absorb the non-conference-servicing costs.

2. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was recommending that the General Assembly should be informed that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.62, no additional appropriations would be required under sections 38 or 41 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

3. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that the intergovernmental conference was an important matter. He noted that the Division for Ocean Affairs, which would provide substantive support for the conference, had four D-1 posts, including one that was currently frozen, in view of which he wondered whether the requests for temporary assistance were justified.

4. Mr. DUVAL (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the only request being made was for temporary assistance for six months, including one post at the D-1 level. The cost of the temporary assistance would be covered from within existing resources.

5. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that the D-1 staff in the Division for Ocean Affairs were highly experienced, and he therefore wondered why the Division staff were not able to discharge the preparatory work without temporary assistance, particularly at the D-1 level. The essential question was whether the Secretary-General of the conference should be assisted by staff recruited from outside.

6. Mr. DUVAL (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that preparation of the conference would represent an additional workload for the Division for Ocean Affairs, and temporary assistance was needed so that the Division's other mandates would not be affected. The provision of temporary assistance did not imply that the staff of the Division would not be involved in preparing the conference.

7. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/47/78) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.62, no additional appropriations would be required under sections 38 and 41 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. The Fifth Committee should further recommend to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, it would authorize on an exceptional basis the payment of travel expenses of representatives of developing countries, especially those most concerned by the subject-matter of the conference, in particular the least developed countries, from the voluntary fund that would be established for the purpose of assisting those countries participating in the conference.

8. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75 concerning agenda item 78 (A/C.5/47/80)

9. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee would have the General Assembly decide to convene a United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) from 3 to 14 June 1996. A Preparatory Committee would be established, open to all States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies. The Preparatory Committee would hold an organizational session of 3 days' duration in March 1993, with two preparatory sessions, the first in early 1994 in Geneva or New York and the second in conjunction with the 1995 session of the Commission on Human Settlements. The General Assembly would accept the offer by the Government of Turkey to host the Conference, and would establish an ad hoc secretariat which would be organizationally part of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat). The Secretary-General of the conference would be appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

10. The overall cost of the conference would be in the range of $2 million to $2.5 million, with $3 million in conference-servicing requirements at full cost. Conference-servicing costs of $118,400 and non-conference-servicing costs of $247,100, totalling $365,500, would be incurred in 1993. Of those, the conference-servicing costs could be absorbed.

11. The Advisory Committee was recommending that the General Assembly should be informed that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75, an additional appropriation of $247,100 would be required under section 19 for the biennium 1992-1993. In addition, an amount of $20,200 would be required under section 36 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

12. Mr. KARBUCZKY (Chairman of the Committee on Conferences) said that the General Assembly, by its resolution 35/10 A, had decided that all proposals relating to the schedule of conferences and meetings made at sessions of the Assembly should be reviewed by the Committee on Conferences when administrative

(Mr. Karbuczky)

implications were being considered. The Committee on Conferences had been duly informed of the proposed programme of work of the Preparatory Committee for Habitat II.

13. Since the established headquarters of the Preparatory Committee was Nairobi, the holding of the organizational session in New York and of the first substantive session in New York or Geneva represented a departure from General Assembly resolution 40/243, which stated that United Nations bodies should meet at their respective established headquarters. The Committee had been informed that conference-servicing resources and facilities were available at Headquarters for the organizational session.

14. On the basis of that information the Committee on Conferences was recommending to the General Assembly that it should grant an exception to the headquarters rule and authorize the Preparatory Committee to meet away from its established headquarters. The Committee would review the matter further as required pending subsequent decisions of the Preparatory Committee at its organizational session.

15. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the Conference on Human Settlements was the second world conference being proposed at the current session, notwithstanding the call for a moratorium on such conferences by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management. In fact, several others were likely to be held in the next few years, entailing unnecessary expenditure. The Conference on Human Settlements alone would cost some $5 million.

16. He asked whether holding the organizational session outside Nairobi would result in a saving for the Organization, since he understood that the cost of meetings at Nairobi was approximately $75,000 per day, owing to the need to fly conference-servicing staff in from Geneva. If that was the case, it might be justified for the Preparatory Committee to meet in New York, where its meetings would cost less, even though it would be a violation of the normal procedure.

17. Mr. DUVAL (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that it would indeed be less expensive to hold the session in New York than in Nairobi. No interpreters were permanently stationed at Nairobi, so that staff would have to be transported from Geneva for the Conference.

18. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said he would have expected the United States delegation to support the headquarters rule. It seemed that whenever matters relating to Habitat were discussed, exceptions to the rule rather than the rule itself were invoked. His delegation would prefer all meetings relating to Habitat II to be held in Nairobi. Regarding the suggested moratorium, it was essential for each conference to be viewed on its merits. It was certainly high time for there to be a review of the question of human settlements.

(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

19. Though his delegation had reservations about the meeting not being held in Nairobi, he understood why the Preparatory Committee wished to meet in New York. It would, inter alia, ensure that more countries could participate given the greater level of representation in New York.

20. The trust fund for financing the participation of least developed countries should be used, given the importance of human settlements issues to those countries. The worth of the Conference was such that attendance should be funded under the regular budget.

21. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation did not welcome the departure from the headquarters rule in the case of the Conference, but simply noted that a saving of more than $200,000 would accrue for a three-day session if it was held in New York rather than Nairobi, owing to the need to transport fewer staff. The matter raised the question of a permanent conference-servicing capacity at Nairobi, the existence of which would make it possible to hold all the relevant meetings in that city.

22. Mr. DUVAL (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the Secretary-General would continue fund-raising to finance participation by least developed countries. At the current stage it was difficult to make any projections, since that would depend on the level of interest evinced by Member States.

23. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/47/80) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.75, an additional appropriation in the amount of $247,100 would be required for 1993 under section 19 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. In addition, an amount of $20,200 would be required under section 36 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

24. It was so decided.

25. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that although his delegation had joined the consensus, it was important for the headquarters meeting rule to be observed as much as possible. Given that exceptions to that rule were frequently made in the case of Nairobi, a conference-servicing capacity must be established at Nairobi in the next programme budget to ensure that meetings could be held there in future.

26. Ms. Rotheiser (Austria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.46, A/C.2/47/L.47 and A/C.2/47/L.61 concerning agenda item 79 (A/C.5/47/81)

27. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/C.2/47/L.46, L.47 and L.61 ("Establishment of an intergovernmental negotiating committee for the elaboration of an international convention to combat desertification ... particularly in Africa", "Convening of a global conference on the sustainable development of small island developing States" and "Institutional arrangements to follow up the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development"). The Secretary-General stated in paragraph 17 of document A/C.5/47/81 that, should the General Assembly adopt the three draft resolutions, an additional appropriation of $2,327,000 would be required under sections 11G, 11H and 31 of the programme budget for 1992-1993, and an additional $168,000 for staff assessment under section 36, to be offset by an equal amount of income under income section 1.

28. The Advisory Committee noted that, according to paragraph 8, the Secretary-General intended to place the Secretariat support structure for those activities within the new Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development. Proposals in that regard would be included in the revised estimates for 1992-1993 which the Secretary-General intended to submit to the General Assembly early in 1993. That being the case, the Advisory Committee believed it unnecessary to provide funds in the full amount requested; it recommended provision for three months.

29. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was recommending that the General Assembly should be informed that, subject to the guidelines for the use of the contingency fund, an additional appropriation of $779,300 would be required for the first three months of 1993, including $331,800 under section 11G for desertification, $418,300 under section 11H for the follow-up to the Conference on Environment and Development and $29,200 under section 31 for public information. An additional amount of $84,000 under section 36 for staff assessment would be required, offset by the same amount under income section 1. Total requirements for the activities arising out of the three draft resolutions would be reviewed in the context of the revised estimates for 1992-1993 to be submitted to the General Assembly at its resumed forty-seventh session.

30. Mr. KARBUCZKY (Chairman of the Committee on Conferences) said that, in accordance with paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 35/10 A, all proposals affecting the schedule of conferences and meetings were reviewed by the Committee on Conferences when administrative implications were being considered under rule 153 of the rules of procedure. Pursuant to that resolution and to the procedures of the Committee on Conferences, members had been informed that the proposed programme of work of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for the Elaboration of an International Convention to Combat Desertification included the convening of an organizational session in New York and substantive sessions at Geneva, Nairobi, New York and Paris.

(Mr. Karbuczky)

31. It was the understanding of the Secretary-General that the substantive session to be held in Paris would come under the terms of section I, paragraph 5, of General Assembly resolution 40/243, and would not represent an exception to the headquarters principle. Since the headquarters of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee would be in Geneva, the organizational session in New York and the substantive sessions in Nairobi and New York represented a departure from section I, paragraph 4, of that resolution, which stated that United Nations bodies should plan to meet at their respective established headquarters.

32. Members of the Committee on Conferences had been informed of the availability of conference-servicing resources at Headquarters for the requested organizational session. The Committee on Conferences therefore was recommending to the General Assembly that it should grant an exception to resolution 40/243, section I, paragraph 4, thereby authorizing the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee to meet away from its established headquarters. Every effort would be made to schedule the substantive sessions in consultation with the Office of Conference Services in order to ensure the best use of existing resources.

33. Mr. OULD CHEIKH EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that document A/C.5/47/81 (para. 8) treated the secretariat of the proposed International Negotiating Committee as an integral part of the new Department for Policy, Coordination and Sustainable Development, whereas the draft resolution called for a separate and independent structure based at Geneva. Six months being the minimum amount of time required for the activities involved, he appealed to the Advisory Committee to reconsider its recommendation.

34. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that he shared the concerns of the representative of Mauritania regarding paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's statement. It was his understanding of paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.46 that the ad hoc secretariat was, by definition, a separate entity and not under the guidance of any other body.

35. With regard to draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.61, he recalled that the dates for the organizational session of the new Commission on Sustainable Development had not been discussed. If the organizational session was held in February 1993, as suggested in paragraph 33 of the Secretary-General's report, it would coincide with the organizational session of the Economic and Social Council.

36. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that his Government attached great importance to the follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, in particular the institutional arrangements. It was not fully satisfied with the justification for the increase of five posts described in paragraph 23 of document A/C.5/47/81. The existing UNCED secretariat would undertake new responsibilities during the transitional period, but the functions of the new body to be created were unclear. He would appreciate receiving job

(Mr. Sugano, Japan)

descriptions for the 10 existing and 5 new posts. Furthermore, the staffing table appeared to be top-heavy: out of 15 posts, 8 were at the D-1 level or above. He wondered whether that structure would be maintained after the transitional period, or whether other categories of staff would be expanded.

37. Mr. AHMIA (Algeria) said that his delegation had already expressed its position regarding the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee in the Second Committee. It shared the concerns of the previous speakers regarding the provision of financial resources for a limited period, and was convinced of the necessity to allocate financial resources for a reasonable period of time so that the Committee could complete its work before June 1994. He asked for clarification of the arrangements to be made after the three-month period had ended.

38. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation had not fully assessed all the programme budget implications of the three draft resolutions, but there was not much evidence that costs had been absorbed where appropriate. His delegation accepted the Advisory Committee's rationale for the three-month appropriation, since the activity and department in question were to be discussed at the resumed session of the General Assembly.

39. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) requested clarifications on the redeployment of staff, what section of the budget was affected and what activities might be forgone in order to accommodate that staffing request. He was pleased that a substantive meeting would be held in Nairobi, since his delegation was of the view that Nairobi would have been an appropriate choice for headquarters of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee.

40. Mr. ASHE (Antigua and Barbuda), speaking with reference to the dates of the organizational session of the Preparatory Committee for the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, said that March 1993 would be preferable to February. He also asked whether bringing in experts for short periods place a burden on the Secretariat.

41. Mr. Dinu (Romania) resumed the Chair.

42. Mr. MENSAH (Vanuatu) said that, when negotiations had been held on the draft resolution on the convening of a global conference on the sustainable development of small island developing States (A/C.2/47/L.47), it had been agreed that the Preparatory Committee for the Conference would hold an organizational session before April 1993. Paragraph 48 of document A/C.5/47/81 indicated that the organizational session would be held in February 1993, although March 1993 would be far preferable to countries with very small delegations.

43. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the recommendations of the Advisory Committee with regard to the Secretary-General's statement on the programme budget

(Mr. Mselle)

implications of draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly for adoption by the Second Committee (A/C.5/47/81) were procedural and interim. The Advisory Committee had received the Secretary-General's statement that very day and had not been able to give it due consideration. For that reason, the Advisory Committee was recommending, not a reduced appropriation, but that a budgetary provision should be made for three months. That would enable the Secretariat to begin implementation of the requested activities. In the meantime, the Advisory Committee would carefully analyse the request and submit its recommendations to the General Assembly at its resumed forty-seventh session.

44. The Advisory Committee was also aware that many of the programmes and activities requested under the draft resolutions were related to one or more clusters of activities to be implemented by some of the departments that were being established. The Advisory Committee wished to review those proposals in the light of the proposal that the Secretary-General would be submitting to the resumed session with regard to the establishment of the new departments, in particular the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development.

45. While he understood that certain delegations which had taken part in the work of the Second Committee might be somewhat displeased with the Advisory Committee's recommendation, he pointed out that the Second Committee had taken almost four months to negotiate the draft resolutions and had given the Advisory Committee only one day to consider them. In the circumstances, the Advisory Committee believed that its recommendations were fair, and reiterated that the amounts allocated simply represented interim arrangements for three months.

46. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that, in paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.46, it had been decided that the proposed Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee would have an ad hoc secretariat. However, paragraph 8 of document A/C.5/47/81 indicated that it was the "intention of the Secretary-General to place the ... secretariat support structure within the new Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development". It was his delegation's understanding that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee would have its own ad hoc secretariat, and it was important to clarify the apparent contradiction in order not to give the wrong impression.

47. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.2/47/L.46, L.47 and L.61, an additional appropriation of $779,300 would be required for the first three months of 1993, including $331,800 under section 11G for desertification, $418,300 under section 11H for the follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, and $29,200 under section 31 for public information; as well as an additional amount of $84,000 under section 36 (Staff assessment), to be offset by the same amount

(The Chairman)

under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). The totality of requirements, which would be subject to the guidelines for the use and operation of the contingency fund, would be reviewed in the context of the revised estimates for 1992-1993 to be submitted to the General Assembly at its resumed forty-seventh session.

48. It was so decided.

49. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation would have no difficulty approving the Advisory Committee's recommendations, which were balanced and took account of the need for the Fifth Committee to impose a modest degree of fiscal responsibility on the Organization.

50. Mr. OULD CHEIKH EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that his delegation welcomed the Advisory Committee's recommendation, which would make it possible to establish the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee and its secretariat, and it understood that the Advisory Committee would not delay in giving comprehensive and thorough consideration to all the texts that had been submitted.

51. Mr. AHMIA (Algeria) said that his delegation fully appreciated the context in which the Advisory Committee had prepared its recommendations, and had taken note of the assurances of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee that that Committee would consider the matter thoroughly and submit its recommendations to the General Assembly at the resumed session. The necessary financial resources must be allocated in order to enable the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee to complete its work successfully by June 1994.

52. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that, in the light of the assurances given by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, it was the understanding of his delegation that paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/47/81 was without prejudice to paragraph 8, paragraph 24 and other subsequent paragraphs of that document.

53. Mr. ASHE (Antigua and Barbuda) said that the Committee should give full consideration to his earlier request, supported by the delegation of Vanuatu that the organizational session of the Preparatory Committee for the Global conference should be held in March rather than February 1993.

54. Mr. DUVAL (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that all the dates of meetings indicated in document A/C.5/47/81 reflected assumptions made at the time of the preparation of the document on the basis of available information. It was his understanding that the Economic and Social Council at its organizational session for 1993 would take a final decision on the dates of the meetings.

55. Mr. AHMIA (Algeria) said that his delegation understood that the budgetary allocations recommended for the establishment of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee had been arrived at in the light of purely technical reasons, not because of a lack of resources.

56. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that his delegation wished to emphasize, for the record, that the amounts stated by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee were merely provisional, and that the Advisory Committee would re-examine them at a later stage, bearing in mind the late submission of document A/C.5/47/81.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/47/L.49 concerning agenda item 80 (A/C.5/47/83)

57. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/47/L.49 (A/C.5/47/83).

58. The requests contained in the draft resolution, which related to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Framework Convention on Climate Change, were enumerated in paragraph 2 of the Secretary-General's statement, while the financial arrangements and estimated resources for implementing the proposed activities were discussed in paragraphs 6 to 18. In that connection, the Secretary-General recalled the arrangements that had been approved for the continuation of the work of the secretariat of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee to the end of 1992. As noted in paragraph 6, resources totalling $1,176,300 had been approved under the regular budget to fund posts as well as non-staff requirements; the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and Governments had also provided staff.

59. In paragraph 9, the Secretary-General stated that should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, it would be his intention to place the secretariat established by the General Assembly in resolution 45/212 within the new Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development. Since the exact features of the new Department were not yet known and would be presented to the Assembly in the context of additional revised estimates early in 1993, the Secretary-General further proposed to maintain the existing secretariat arrangements. The interim secretariat would continue to be located in Geneva and would consist of one D-2, one D-1, one P-4, one P-3 and one P-2 to be financed from the regular budget. The posts currently financed by WMO would remain available in 1993 and contributions from other specialized agencies and organizations of the United Nations system would be sought through bilateral arrangements.

60. As stated in paragraph 11, a P-2 and a P-3 post were available for temporary redeployment to the interim secretariat. The Secretary-General stated that the other posts, namely, one D-2, one D-1, one P-4 and four General Service posts, would be identified for redeployment from within the new Department or other parts of the Secretariat and that such redeployment

(Mr. Mselle)

would be presented in the forthcoming revised estimates. Pending that identification and redeployment, the Secretary-General proposed to finance the posts from general temporary assistance and therefore requested a provision of $379,000, which represented six work-months for each of those seven posts. The Secretary-General added that in the event of difficulties in identifying posts at the appropriate levels before 30 June 1993, a report would be submitted to the Advisory Committee.

61. Non-staff requirements for 1993 were estimated at $359,000, as shown in paragraph 13 of the Secretary-General's statement. Consequently, the total substantive requirements in 1993 amounted to $738,000. As explained in paragraph 15, the estimated conference-servicing requirements in 1993, on a full-cost basis, amounted to $990,000.

62. It was estimated that no additional resources would be required for conference-servicing activities under section 41 of the programme budget for 1992-1993. However, because no activities had been proposed for termination, deferral, curtailment or modification in the programme budget for 1992-1993, in order to provide additional resources for the proposed activities, the Secretary-General concluded that, should the draft resolution be adopted, an additional appropriation of $738,000 would be required under section 11F of the programme budget for 1992-1993, subject to the guidelines for the operation and use of the contingency fund. In addition, an amount of $119,200 would be required under section 36 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). As indicated in paragraph 21, it would also be necessary to amend the narrative of the programme of work under section 11F, in the manner indicated in paragraph 5 of the statement.

63. As noted in paragraph 1 of the Secretary-General's statement, the draft resolution had been considered by the Second Committee, which had subsequently decided to send it to the General Assembly in plenary meeting for further consideration. In that connection, the Advisory Committee had been informed that the Second Committee had been unable to reach agreement as to how to treat the reference in the draft resolution to the programme of work determined by the sixth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, which had been held from 7 to 10 December in Geneva.

64. The Committee had further been informed that the estimate contained in document A/C.5/47/83 represented a maintenance level of the present arrangements in order to enable the secretariat of the Negotiating Committee to carry out its work for the first six months of 1993, it being the Secretary-General's intention to report in the context of the revised estimates on the totality of the resources required for the secretariat.

65. That being the case, and bearing in mind the Secretary-General's statement that the revised estimates would be submitted early next year, the Advisory Committee did not believe that it was necessary to provide six months

of general temporary assistance for the posts concerned or to provide for non-staff items for all of 1993. The Committee therefore was recommending that a provision for three months should be approved in respect of both general temporary assistance and non-staff items. In making that recommendation, the Committee pointed out that should the revised estimates be delayed, the Secretary-General could submit a report to the Advisory Committee.

66. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was recommending that the General Assembly should be informed that, should it adopt draft resolution A/47/L.49, an additional appropriation of $279,250 would be required at the current stage under section 11F of the programme budget for 1992-1993, subject to the guidelines for the operation and use of the contingency fund and on the understanding that the totality of the requirements would be reviewed in the context of the revised estimates for 1992-1993 to be submitted to the General Assembly at its resumed forty-seventh session. In addition, an amount of $59,600 would be required under section 36 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

67. Mrs. CLIFF (United Kingdom) drew attention to paragraph 15 of document A/C.5/47/83, which referred to the assumption that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee would hold two sessions of 10 days each in 1993 at Geneva. Paragraph 18 explained that the estimated conference-servicing requirements would be met from the resources provided under section 41 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. It should be noted, however, that on 10 December 1992, a decision had been taken to hold one of the two scheduled meetings in New York, thus giving rise to travel and subsistence costs for the members of the secretariat of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. Her delegation would be grateful for information on the probable additional costs, the manner in which those costs would be submitted to the Fifth Committee and whether the Committee on Conferences would need to be involved, as the decision to hold a meeting in New York represented a departure from the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolution 40/243.

68. Mr. DUVAL (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division), said that the change of venue would not affect the assumption that the conference-servicing requirements could be absorbed within the overall resources provided under section 41 of the programme budget, as provision was made in that section for meetings which had not yet been approved by the General Assembly. With regard to travel costs for staff to service the meeting, any change in the assumptions would, as stated in paragraph 15 of document A/C.5/47/83, be treated in accordance with existing procedures; in other words, should there be additional requirements which could not be absorbed within the resources approved on the basis of the current statement of programme budget implications, the Secretary-General would seek approval from the Advisory Committee for a further appropriation.

69. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/47/83) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/47/L.49, an additional appropriation of $279,250 would be required at the current stage under section 11F of the programme budget for 1992-1993, subject to the guidelines for the operation and use of the contingency fund, and on the understanding that the totality of the requirements would be reviewed in the context of the revised estimates for 1992-1993 to be submitted to the General Assembly at its resumed forty-seventh session. In addition, an amount of $59,600 would be required at the current stage under section 36 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

70. It was so decided.

Revised estimates under section 38: Commission of Experts established pursuant to Security Council resolution 780 (1992) (A/C.5/47/68)

71. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered document A/C.5/47/68, in which the Secretary-General submitted revised estimates under section 38, Legal activities.

72. As stated in paragraph 2, by paragraph 2 of its resolution 780 (1992) of 6 October 1992, the Security Council had requested the Secretary-General to establish, as a matter of urgency, an impartial commission of experts on violations of international law committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia. As noted in paragraph 3, the Secretary-General had since established the Commission of Experts, consisting of five members who would serve in their personal capacity, one of whom had been designated Chairman. The Chairman would receive compensation equivalent to salary at the Assistant Secretary-General level and the other members of the Commission would receive compensation on an as-worked basis equivalent to the salary of a D-2. The Commission would be serviced as a legal body by the Office of Legal Affairs. The Secretary-General had decided that the Commission would be located at the United Nations Office at Geneva and would be supported by a small secretariat consisting of three Legal Officers at the D-1, P-4 and P-3 levels, assisted by two General Service staff members. The requirements for 1992-1993, estimated on a full-cost basis, amounted to $1,238,700, as explained in paragraphs 6 to 8 of document A/C.5/47/68. That amount included $905,300 for the Commission and its secretariat, $26,900 for travel costs in respect of its mission to the territory of the former Yugoslavia and $306,500 for conference-servicing costs. The Secretary-General proposed to deploy in 1993 a D-1 post and a P-3 post in keeping with the new treatment of vacancies and to use the P-4 post of Legal Liaison Officer at Geneva for that purpose. Accordingly, no additional resources would be required in respect of those costs.

(Mr. Mselle)

73. Since the programme budget for 1992-1993 provided not only for meetings known at the time of budget preparation but also for meetings that would be authorized subsequently, no additional appropriations would be required for conference-servicing costs. Accordingly the Secretary-General estimated that an amount of $681,900 would be required under section 38, Legal activities, of the programme budget for 1992-1993 to cover the requirements for the compensation and travel of members of the Commission, as well as travel of its secretariat and general operating expenses. In the Secretary-General's view, the implementation of Security Council resolution 780 (1992) related to the maintenance of peace and security. Accordingly, it was also his view that the related requirements of $681,900 that would arise were of an extraordinary nature, relative to the maintenance of peace and security, and should be treated outside the procedures governing the contingency fund.

74. The Advisory Committee concurred in that approach; however, bearing in mind the small amount required in respect of data-processing services, rental and maintenance of office equipment, supplies and office automation equipment, the Advisory Committee recommended that the estimate should be increased by $35,200. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was recommending that an additional appropriation of $646,700 should be approved under section 38 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

75. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it approve an additional appropriation of $646,700 under section 38 of the programme budget for 1992-1993, on the understanding that those requirements would be treated outside the procedures related to the contingency fund.

76. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 9.30 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
50th meeting
held on
Saturday, 19 December 1992
at 8 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 50th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DINU (Romania)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Revised estimates under section 28: Centre for Human Rights (continued)

United Nations Observer Mission in South Africa (UNOMSA)

Programme budget implications of recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Coordination in 1992

Programme budget implications of installing an appropriate signalling system

Administrative and financial arrangements regarding the United Nations International Drug Control Programme

Programme on Space Applications

Letter from the Chairman of the Special Political Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee regarding the budgetary allocations for the Programme on Space Applications

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.91 concerning agenda item 89 (a)

Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.26

Programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.5/47/L.26 concerning agenda item 104

First programme budget performance report

/...

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58311 6598S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/47/SR.50
29 January 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 147: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991

Final appropriations for 1990-1991

AGENDA ITEM 102: FINANCIAL REPORTS AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND REPORTS OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 105: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 113: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 109: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 115: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON

AGENDA ITEM 116: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS IRAN-IRAQ MILITARY OBSERVER GROUP (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 118: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS TRANSITION ASSISTANCE GROUP (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 120: FINANCING OF THE ACTIVITIES ARISING FROM SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 687 (1991) (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS IRAQ-KUWAIT OBSERVATION MISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 123: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITY IN CAMBODIA (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 137: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PROTECTION FORCE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 124: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 111: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 8.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Revised estimates under section 28: Centre for Human Rights (continued) (A/C.5/47/71)

1. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco), reporting on the informal consultations held on the revised estimates relating to the Centre for Human Rights, said that a compromise text had been worked out.

2. The CHAIRMAN read out the text of the proposal as follows:

"The General Assembly takes note of the revised estimates submitted by the Secretary-General in his report (A/C.5/47/71) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

"Endorses the proposal of the Secretary-General on the understanding that, with regard to his request for $760,000, the Secretary-General would implement within the overall level of the revised appropriation for 1992-1993, the other activities of the Centre for Human Rights, for which he has requested additional resources and would report to the General Assembly through the final budget performance report 1992-1993."

3. He took it that the Committee agreed to the proposal.

4. It was so decided.

United Nations Observer Mission in South Africa (UNOMSA) (A/C.5/47/79)

5. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/47/79) and the additional information furnished by the representative of the Secretary-General concerning, inter alia, changes in the number of civilian observers. The Committee trusted that the Secretary-General would keep the staffing of the mission under constant review according to the changing circumstances in the mission area.

6. The Committee was of the view that the proposed number of vehicles (35 to be purchased and another 35 to be rented for a five-month period, in addition to rental of a fixed-wing aircraft and/or helicopter) was high in relation to the number of staff. It believed that the vehicles should be purchased locally as soon as possible to reduce rental costs. The Committee had been informed that the host country had not made available premises free of cost and it trusted that the Secretary-General would pursue his efforts with the host Government to obtain premises at no cost to the Mission.

(Mr. Mselle)

7. Subject to the foregoing, the Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee inform the General Assembly that an additional appropriation of $13,121,300 would be required under section 2 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 for UNOMSA from mid-September 1992 to 31 December 1993, and an additional appropriation of $1,673,200 would also be required under section 36 (Staff assessment), offset by the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). The Committee requested the Secretary-General to submit to it, at its spring session of 1993, a performance report on the mission, including actual expenditure from its inception, and revised requirements for 1993, taking into account the developments in the region.

8. Mr. FONTAINE (Cuba), while fully supporting the report of the Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General's proposal, suggested that the Fifth Committee should specify that any decision it took would be without prejudice to the future mode of financing UNOMSA.

9. Mr. SENGWE (Zimbabwe) said that his delegation supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and would also go along with the proposal by the representative of Cuba.

10. Mr. RAE (India) fully endorsed the comments made by the representative of Cuba.

11. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it approve an appropriation of $13,121,300 required under section 2 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 for UNOMSA from mid-September 1992 to 31 December 1993, on the understanding that those requirements would be treated outside the procedures related to the contingency fund and without prejudice to the future mode of financing. Furthermore, an additional appropriation of $1,673,200 would be required under section 36, to be offset by the same amount under income section 1.

12. In addition, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to submit to the Advisory Committee, at its spring session of 1993, a performance report on UNOMSA, including actual expenditures from its inception and revised requirements for 1993, taking into account the developments in the region.

13. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Coordination in 1992 (A/47/16 (Part I and Part II)/Add.1 and 2)

14. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the statements submitted by the Secretary-General on programme budget implications arising from the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee for

(Mr. Mselle)

Programme and Coordination (CPC). It had noted from paragraph 11 of the first statement (A/47/16 (Part I and Part II)/Add.1) that there would be no reimbursement of travel costs for the joint meetings of CPC and the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) in 1993 since the appropriation for travel costs had been used up in 1992. The proposal to hold the joint meetings of CPC and ACC in the spring of 1993 had been made before the venue of the spring session of ACC had been decided; it had since been confirmed that ACC would be meeting in Rome. The Advisory Committee noted that it had been the Secretariat's understanding that if the meetings were held in Rome it would be at the invitation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and no additional conference-servicing costs would arise. He drew attention to paragraph 2 of the second statement (A/47/16 (Part I and Part II/Add.2) in which it was pointed out that that understanding was incorrect, since FAO did not have a large conference-servicing facility. It was estimated that an amount of $135,000 would be required under section 1 of the budget for 1992-1993 for conference-servicing costs to be reimbursed to FAO. The Advisory Committee had been informed that the Secretariat had been unable to verify the basis on which that estimate had been arrived at. The Advisory Committee was somewhat surprised that FAO was requesting reimbursement of costs for the joint meetings, since ACC would be meeting in Rome at the invitation of FAO, and it therefore recommended that the Secretariat should make every effort to persuade FAO not to seek reimbursement of the conference-servicing costs of the joint meetings.

15. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation would not be prepared to approve the proposal since the Committee was being informed at the last minute that the joint meetings would be held in Rome and at an additional cost of $135,000. Moreover, that figure did not include the travel of CPC members or of Secretariat staff required to service the meetings. He suggested that CPC should reconsider the venue.

16. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands), Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Coordination, informed the Committee that in the letter he had sent to the Secretary-General, on behalf of CPC, he had pointed out that members of CPC would prefer the next joint meetings to be held in New York.

17. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) recalled that, since the heads of agencies had not been in a position to meet in 1992, CPC had reluctantly agreed to defer the joint meetings until 1993. He expressed the hope that the United States representative would not insist on his reservation, adding that he himself intended to return to the issue of travel costs when the Committee discussed travel entitlements at its resumed session.

18. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) pointed out that when CPC had agreed to defer the joint meetings, it had had no idea that the next session of ACC would be held in Rome. While his delegation continued to support the joint meetings process, it believed that such meetings were of limited usefulness and saw no point in spending some $200,000 simply to meet in Rome.

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

It therefore could not approve an additional appropriation at that time and suggested that the Committee defer a decision on the venue until its resumed session.

19. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the following decision:

> "The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it take note of the information provided and observations made by the Chairmen of CPC and ACABQ on the matter and recommends to the Secretary-General that the next series of joint ACC/CPC meetings take place in New York".

20. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of installing an appropriate signalling system (A/47/32 and A/C.5/47/23)

21. The CHAIRMAN recalled that in paragraph 116 of its report (A/47/32), the Committee on Conferences decided to recommend to the General Assembly that it should install portable devices to be used in enforcing limits on the length of statements by delegations, as described in paragraph 15 of the report of the Secretary-General (A/47/287), in sufficient numbers and in the most cost-effective manner possible. In paragraph 117 of the report, the Committee on Conferences requested the Secretariat to take into account the number of meetings at each conference-servicing location with a view to determining the number of devices required, when preparing the relevant statement of programme budget implications.

22. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that it was the Advisory Committee's view that the General Assembly should first decide whether there should be time-limits on speeches and statements, and whether that decision would be consistently enforced; otherwise, the installation of a signalling system would be a waste of money. The Advisory Committee had been informed that there was such a device in the General Assembly Hall for enforcing time-limits on statements, but that it was hardly ever used.

23. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it endorse the Advisory Committee's comments with respect to the installation of an appropriate signalling system.

24. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial arrangements regarding the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (A/C.5/47/44)

25. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the note by the Secretariat on the administrative and financial arrangements regarding the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (A/C.5/47/44).

26. It was so decided.

Programme on Space Applications

Letter from the Chairman of the Special Political Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee regarding the budgetary allocations for the Programme on Space Applications (A/C.5/47/51)

27. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of document A/C.5/47/51 containing a letter from the Chairman of the Special Political Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee regarding the budgetary allocations for the Programme on Space Applications.

28. It was so decided.

29. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) recalled that the space applications programme had been considered a major achievement of UNISPACE 82; through the programme, developing countries were to be assisted in developing space literacy so that they would be able to benefit from the exploration of outer space and the technology deriving therefrom. Experience had shown, however, that despite the high-sounding words of commitment, the funds made available for the programme had been very much below the mark. He hoped that his comments would be taken into account by the Secretary-General when preparing the next programme budget.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.91 concerning agenda item 89 (a) (A/C.5/47/82)

30. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly the following decision:

> "The General Assembly decides that, in order to provide for the minimal transitional requirements for UNITAR until the General Assembly can consider this matter at its resumed forty-seventh session, the Secretary-General is authorized to commit funds, not to exceed $400,000 for the period 1 January through 28 February 1993, by advances from the Working Capital Fund, to cover all costs related to the provision of security and maintenance of the UNITAR premises, as well as the costs of

(The Chairman)

maintaining the existing staff members of the UNITAR New York office for whom placement is to be sought elsewhere within the United Nations system, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 42/197 of 11 December 1987."

31. Mr. AL-ARIMI (Oman) requested clarification on what the amount of $400,000 would be used for. His delegation had been under the impression that the transfer of UNITAR to Geneva would produce savings.

32. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that the Committee was not required to take a decision on whether UNITAR should move to Geneva or on any aspect of draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.91 other than its programme budget implications. The authorization to commit funds would make it possible to maintain UNITAR in its existing form until a decision was taken by the General Assembly at its resumed session; the funds would be used for security and maintenance, and for staff costs.

33. Mr. ORR (Canada) said that the amount of $400,000 seemed excessively high for just two months. He noted that in paragraph 14 of document A/C.5/47/82, the annual cost for building maintenance and security was only $647,000, and transitional costs were $612,500 for six months.

34. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that if the Committee took no action on the programme budget implications, the General Assembly would be unable to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/47/L.91 at the resumed forty-seventh session. The Secretariat was not requesting additional funds, but authorization to commit funds from the regular budget. Of the $400,000, approximately $100,000 was for security and maintenance and $300,000 for personnel, for January and February. Even if UNITAR was transferred to Geneva, those costs would be incurred in the transitional period.

35. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that the Committee did not appear to have received any advice on the matter from the Advisory Committee. It was not clear to his delegation why office space would need to be rented, or what building maintenance and security would be needed over the next two months. On the basis of an annual cost of $647,000 for building maintenance and security, and a six-month cost of transitional arrangements of $612,500, an amount of $312,000 should be adequate.

36. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that one staff member would be retiring during the two-month period in question so there would be common staff costs relating to repatriation. The Secretariat was requesting authorization to spend up to $400,000 but if the actual costs were lower, that would be reflected in the performance report.

37. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) asked whether the United Nations needed the office space in the UNITAR building.

38. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) suggested that since the Advisory Committee had had no time to consider the matter, the words "With the concurrence of ACABQ" should be inserted in the Committee's proposal.

39. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that in the absence of a decision by the General Assembly on the future of UNITAR, funds had to be advanced from the regular budget to keep UNITAR operating. The Committee's decision, if adopted, would authorize spending for UNITAR in January and February; otherwise, UNITAR would have to be closed. The General Assembly did not need prior permission from the Advisory Committee to authorize the Secretariat to commit funds.

40. As long as there was staff in the UNITAR building, funds were needed for maintenance and security. Until the General Assembly decided otherwise, the building belonged to UNITAR; no decision had been taken on what would happen to the building if UNITAR moved to Geneva.

41. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly the decision he had read out earlier, with the addition of the words "with the concurrence of ACABQ" after the words "not to exceed $400,000".

42. It was so decided.

43. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that he hoped the Secretariat would consider the possibility of demolishing the UNITAR building; that would cost less than repairs and maintenance.

Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.26

44. Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.26 was adopted.

Programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.5/47/L.26 concerning agenda item 104 (A/C.5/47/84)

45. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered document A/C.5/47/84 concerning the programme budget implications of meetings of the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) during one week in May 1993 and three weeks in August and September 1993. The programme budget implications related to the payment to the members of CPC of travel expenses and subsistence allowance. The Advisory Committee concurred in the estimates contained in document A/C.5/47/84 and, accordingly, recommended that an additional appropriation of $86,400 should be included under section 1 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

46. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/47/84) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform

(The Chairman)

the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft decision A/C.5/47/L.26, an additional appropriation estimated at $86,400 would be required under section 1 of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

47. It was so decided.

First programme budget performance report (A/C.5/47/47 and A/C.5/47/77)

48. Mr. ORR (Canada), referring to document A/C.5/47/47, drew attention to paragraph 16 (b), which showed an increase of $21.8 million for changes in the percentage rate of common staff costs. It was difficult to understand why common staff costs were increasing at such an alarming rate when there was no corresponding increase in salaries. His delegation also wondered why there had been such a delay in the submission of the first performance report to the Committee. Document A/C.5/47/47, which was dated 14 December 1992, provided data only up to the end of September 1992 for all duty stations except New York, and up to the end of October for New York, although the Committee had been informed that the Secretariat had delayed the issuance of the report in order that the data might be as up to date as possible. His delegation feared that a precedent was being established whereby substantial increases in net requirements would be submitted to the Fifth Committee only at the end of the session.

49. With regard to changes in the rates of inflation, the data provided in schedule 1 did not appear to account for the increase of $36.9 million mentioned in paragraph 8 of the document. Excluding staff assessment, the increase amounted only to $14.2 million, or 0.6 per cent of the total initial appropriation. The assumptions used in the preparation of the 1992-1993 budget appeared to have been fairly accurate, in that the rates experienced had been close to those projected. For two of the three major duty stations, namely, New York and Geneva, the assumed rates of inflation had been higher than the revised average rates for the budget period; thus, savings could have been expected. Nevertheless, in annex II (b), under the column headed "Adjustments to inflation", increases of $11.5 million and $9.8 million, respectively, were shown for New York and Geneva. His delegation requested the Secretariat to confirm that those amounts related to staff assessment, which had been offset by savings from lower-than-anticipated rates of inflation. His delegation further requested that in future programme budget performance reports, the inflation factor should be indicated separately from changes in staff assessment.

50. The inflation rates for the other duty stations had been fairly consistent with the assumed rates, with very few exceptions. In those cases, since the majority of the expenditures had been in United States dollars, there should have been no significant increase in costs.

51. Mr. DUVAL (Programme Planning and Budget Division), replying to the previous speaker's question concerning the increase in common staff costs, said that the estimate had been based on the experience of the first nine months of the biennium. While the Secretariat was unable to provide the Committee with a full-fledged analysis, there were indications that the payments to staff members for education grants and home leave had been higher than had been anticipated at the time of the preparation of the 1992-1993 budget. Those two entitlements accounted for a large portion of the increase of $21.8 million.

52. With regard to the question concerning the quality of the data, the Secretariat had been able to provide actual data only up to the end of October 1992; although the report was dated 14 December 1992, the calculations on which it was based had been completed by 1 or 2 December. The Secretariat had waited to issue the report until the figures on the operational rate of exchange for December had been available so that a projection could be made for the rest of the biennium.

53. As to the question concerning the provision for inflation, as shown in the summary table of expenditures, the inflation rates indicated in schedule 1 were applicable to non-post objects of expenditure, which meant that salaries were not covered. The major part of the provision of $37 million was attributable to increases in base salaries resulting from a substantial increase in staff assessment. As indicated in paragraph 20 of document A/C.5/47/47, the increase in staff assessment was due mainly to the consolidation of classes of post adjustment into base salaries. Two such operations had been factored into the report, in one case for the consolidation that had taken place on 1 March 1992, and in the second case for the projected consolidation effective 1 March 1993. Those increases had been explained in the section on methodology. He agreed with the Canadian representative that it might be confusing to list two items under the same category; that would be taken into account in future reports.

54. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the previous statement had answered some of his delegation's questions concerning staff assessment. At the same time, it was his understanding that the main purpose of staff assessment was to reimburse United States nationals employed by the United Nations who were subject to United States taxes. His Government again asked whether the amount which the United Nations would spend on tax reimbursements in 1993 was approximately the same as the amount of staff assessment to be collected from Member States which taxed their nationals who worked for the United Nations, and whether that was the same as the amount to be deposited in the Tax Equalization Fund.

55. With regard to the increase in common staff costs, the Board of Auditors, in its report on the 1991 accounts, had found that control over the payment of the benefits to which the Canadian representative had referred was rather slack, a factor which might have contributed to the increase.

56. Mr. NA CHAMPASSAK (Australia) expressed his delegation's satisfaction at the savings of $1.4 million realized under section 1.

57. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that while his delegation, too, appreciated the savings made, it was concerned at the delay in the issuance of the report until the end of the session.

58. With regard to the relocation of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) to Amman, which, as indicated by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, had occasioned a substantial increase in common staff costs, his delegation would appreciate information on the allowances and benefits which had given rise to such costs and on whether there was any legislative basis for anticipating a similarly high level of costs in 1993.

59. Mr. DUVAL (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the rates of staff assessment must be set at a level high enough to meet the Organization's obligation to reimburse staff members who were subject to national taxation on their United Nations income. The rates of staff assessment had not fully corresponded to the rates of tax increases charged to the Tax Equalization Fund, which had resulted in an increasing balance in the Fund. The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) was responsible for reviewing the rates of staff assessment, and it was his understanding that ICSC would review those rates in 1993.

60. For 1993, the amount which was expected to be charged to the Tax Equalization Fund was approximately $44 million. The amount of staff assessment collected from the United States totalled $27.4 million for the period January to June 1992. By the end of 1992, there would be a surplus of several million dollars in the Fund.

61. Replying to the question raised by the United Kingdom representative, he said that the substantial increase in common staff costs for ESCWA for 1992 would be matched by a corresponding increase in 1993. In 1992, the increase had been fuelled mainly by the payment of subsistence to staff members following their relocation and, in some cases, compensation to staff members for lost or stolen property.

62. Mr. ORR (Canada) suggested that the Committee should request the Secretary-General to take steps to improve the timeliness and transparency of the budget performance report.

63. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should urge ICSC to review the rates of staff assessment during the biennium 1992-1993.

64. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the first programme budget performance report (A/C.5/47/47) and approve the Secretary-General's revised requirements. The Assembly should also request

(The Chairman)

the Secretary-General to take steps to improve the timeliness and transparency of the budget performance report, and should further request ICSC to review the rates of staff assessment during the biennium 1992-1993.

65. Mr. BIRAUD (France) asked whether the Committee was recommending that ICSC should simply review the rates of assessment, or should examine the whole question of staff assessment.

66. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that another draft resolution was in preparation which requested the Secretary-General to review the whole question of staff assessment; accordingly, the Committee's recommendation should refer simply to the rates.

67. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt his suggestion.

68. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 147: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991

Final appropriations for 1990-1991 (A/C.5/46/46/Add.1 and A/C.5/47/47)

69. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it accept the Advisory Committee's recommendations with regard to the unliquidated obligations and that it decide to revert to the question of the final appropriations for the biennium 1990-1991 at its resumed forty-seventh session.

70. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 102: FINANCIAL REPORTS AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND REPORTS OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS (continued) (A/C.5/47/L.23 and L.27)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.23 and draft decision A/C.5/47/L.27

71. Mr. OSELLA (Argentina), Rapporteur, introducing the draft resolution and the draft decision on which consensus had been reached in informal consultations, said that the former was aimed at improving resource management and allocation in all United Nations organizations and programmes. He reviewed the provisions of the draft resolution, with particular emphasis on paragraphs 1, 4 to 6, 9 to 10, 13 to 14 and 18, and the provisions of the draft decision, and recommended their adoption without a vote.

72. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.23 was adopted.

73. Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.27 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 105: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/C.5/47/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.18

74. Mr. DUHALT (Mexico) reviewed the provisions of the draft resolution, which dealt with a very political item and with contentious issues such as the placement in the budget of subprogramme 4 of programme 4 of the medium-term plan. He believed, however, that the informal consultations had produced a text that could be adopted without a vote.

75. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.18 was adopted.

76. Mr. BIRAUD (France), speaking in explanation of position on the annex to the draft resolution just adopted, and referring to the revision by which subprogramme 4 of programme 4 would be implemented in the context of draft resolutions A/C.3/47/L.61 and L.69, observed that electoral assistance operations did not necessarily involve situations that required peace-keeping or that threatened human rights, and that consequently the "full coordination" mentioned in the new text must be taken seriously. It was not absolutely necessary for the subprogramme to be implemented by the office of the senior official designated as a focal point, which had not been originally intended in resolution 46/137 to develop into an extensive bureaucracy. His delegation therefore found it surprising that the Electoral Assistance Unit had been set up by the Secretary-General (A/47/668, para. 10) without a prior mandate.

77. France continued to believe that, as a rule, election verification operations should be funded from the regular budget and not from voluntary contributions. Fairness and transparency, and independence of any donor agenda, should be the mark of those essentially apolitical operations.

AGENDA ITEM 113: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM (continued) (A/47/7/Add.6; A/C.5/47/37; A/C.5/47/L.7)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.7

78. Mr. DUHALT (Mexico), reporting on the informal consultations that had been held on the basis of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) recommendations, said that it had been decided to treat the question of pensions separately. Reviewing the provisions of the draft resolution and its two annexes, he observed that, despite differing views on aspects of annex II, expecially on the base/floor salary scale and its linkage with the mobility and hardship allowance scheme, agreement had been reached on the text and he recommended it for adoption without a vote.

79. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.7 was adopted.

80. Mr. BIRAUD (France) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which, with its general endorsement of the ICSC recommendations, particularly the proposed increase in the base/floor salary scale, represented a vote of

(Mr. Biraud, France)

confidence in the Commission. Under section II.A, paragraph 3, of the draft resolution, the Commission was also being relied upon for the application of the new methodology for determining the cost-of-living differential between New York and Washington, D.C., on the basis of the groundwork proposed in the ICSC report (A/47/30, para. 143).

81. It was France's understanding that the draft resolution, in the sole operative paragraph of section II.C, referred to the Noblemaire principle as it had first been set out by the United Nations in 1972 in document A/8728; and that, in inviting ICSC to study all aspects of the application of the Noblemaire principle with a view to ensuring the competitiveness of the United Nations common system, that paragraph gave it a very broad mandate, covering not only past interpretations and applications of the principle by the General Assembly over the years, but also other possible applications by institutions such as the World Bank and the European Communities, which in terms of their size and structure were suitable for comparison with the United Nations.

82. In carrying out that mandate in close cooperation with the various United Nations institutions, ICSC must carefully study and weigh all relevant facts, especially those bearing on difficulties in recruiting and retaining high-level Professional staff, and on the identification of the main competitors for specialized personnel in a given occupational group; on the current practice of public and private employers in providing compensation as an adjustment for relative cost-of-living differences outside the home country; and on the long-term purchasing-power trends in the main duty stations of the United Nations system. France endorsed the approach proposed by the Commission in paragraph 177 of its report (A/47/30) relating to special occupational rates and believed that the factors to which he had just referred should be taken into account in that connection.

AGENDA ITEM 109: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued) (A/C.5/47/L.10)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.10

83. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), reporting on the informal consultations on the draft resolution, reviewed its provisions and recommended its adoption without a vote.

84. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.10 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 115: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE (A/C.5/47/L.12)

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON (A/C.5/47/L.13)

Draft resolutions A/C.5/47/L.12 and L.13

85. Mr. RAMOS (Spain), reporting on the informal consultations, reviewed the two texts and drew particular attention to the specific financing provisions in paragraphs 3, 6, 7 and 9 to 11 of draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.12 and in paragraphs 2 to 5 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.13. He recommended their adoption without a vote.

86. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.12 was adopted.

87. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.13 was adopted.

88. Mr. BARIMANI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his Government's position on the peace-keeping forces in the Middle East was clear and that, had the two resolutions just adopted been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained.

AGENDA ITEM 116: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS IRAN-IRAQ MILITARY OBSERVER GROUP (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.4

89. Mr. RAMOS (Spain) introduced the draft resolution and recommended that the Committee should adopt it without a vote.

90. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.4 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 118: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS TRANSITION ASSISTANCE GROUP (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.14

91. Ms. SHITAKHA (Kenya) introduced the draft resolution and recommended that it should be adopted without a vote.

92. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.14 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 120: FINANCING OF THE ACTIVITIES ARISING FROM SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 687 (1991) (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS IRAQ-KUWAIT OBSERVATION MISSION (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.5

93. Ms. SHITAKHA (Kenya) introduced the draft resolution and recommended that it should be adopted without a vote.

94. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that, in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, the words "should the Security Council review the mandate of the Mission in respect of the period beyond 8 April 1993;" should be replaced by the words "subject to the review by the Security Council of the mandate of the Mission in respect of the period beyond 8 April 1993;", which were used in the fourth and fifth lines of paragraph 8; that was the correct formulation.

95. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.5, as orally amended, was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 123: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITY IN CAMBODIA (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.15

96. Mr. RAMOS (Spain) introduced the draft resolution and recommended that the Committee should adopt it without a vote.

97. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.15 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 137: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PROTECTION FORCE (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.16

98. Ms. SHITAKHA (Kenya) introduced the draft resolution and recommended that it should be adopted without a vote.

99. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.16 was adopted.

100. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) said that his delegation's position on the financing of the expansion of that particular operation into Bosnia and Herzegovina was well known.

101. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, said that the European Community strongly supported United Nations peace-keeping operations and was pleased that all the appropriations and resolutions on which action had been taken had been adopted without a vote. The European Community hoped that all Member States would demonstrate their well-established commitment through full and prompt payment of the resulting assessments. The European Community's practice in that regard was well known.

(Mr. Kinchen, United Kingdom)

102. The European Community was concerned about the regularity with which appropriations for peace-keeping operations exceeded actual expenditure, and also about the practice of retaining unencumbered balances to compensate for underfinancing that was in no way their responsibility. That practice could not continue indefinitely. In future, the Committee should devote more time to the examination of the estimates for peace-keeping operations, especially in the light of the very substantial sums of money involved.

AGENDA ITEM 124: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.8

103. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada), introducing the draft resolution, said that the blank spaces in paragraph (f) (i) had been left for the numbers and dates of the General Assembly's resolutions on the United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) and the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). He recommended that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

104. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.8 was adopted.

105. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that the establishment of the Peace-keeping Reserve Fund was without prejudice to any activities approved by the General Assembly. Moreover, the addition of paragraph (k) had also facilitated his delegation's acceptance of the draft.

106. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that his delegation had always supported the efforts of the former and the current Secretary-General to secure the financial basis of the Organization in the field of maintenance of peace and security. His delegation was also aware of the long-standing position of the Nordic countries to establish a reserve fund to facilitate the start-up of peace-keeping operations.

107. No working capital fund or revolving fund could sustain its functions unless early and full reimbursement was ensured. In that respect, his delegation emphasized the paramount importance of the obligations of all Member States to finance the expenses of the Organization as apportioned by the General Assembly, as well as the need for them to pay their assessed contributions in full and on time. Moreover, the establishment of the Peace-keeping Reserve Fund would in no way obviate the need for improving and accelerating procedures for preparing and approving peace-keeping budgets and the speedier issuance of assessment letters to Member States.

The meeting was suspended at 12.35 a.m. and resumed at 1.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 111: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

108. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) said that he had held informal consultations with the representatives of those delegations which had requested that a legal opinion should be sought on various matters in connection with agenda item 111, as well as with the representative of the Russian Federation. All those concerned had shown great flexibility and efforts had been made to avoid raising political issues which fell outside the Committee's sphere of competence. However, some of the delegations needed to seek instructions on the various possible solutions that had been envisaged and no final agreement had been reached. In addition, the question of the scale of assessments needed to be concluded before the matter of the legal opinion could be settled.

109. Mr. NOVRUZOV (Azerbaijan) said that, despite the difficult situation it faced as a result of the scale of assessments, his delegation had acted in a spirit of compromise during the consultations and had made all the concessions that had been requested of it. As a result, it had secured nothing of what it wanted. Moreover, the Committee had failed to deal with the request in good time and the fact that it had not been possible to secure a legal opinion at the present juncture did not mean that the request should simply be dropped. In the view of his delegation, the matter was certainly not closed and the delegations concerned wanted an answer to their request. In the meantime, his delegation reserved its right to full freedom of action.

AGENDA ITEM 112: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

110. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) said that informal consultations had so far failed to produce a consensus text. A number of problems were still outstanding, notably the question of desirable ranges. All the delegations concerned agreed that the resolution should be adopted by consensus and more time was therefore needed.

111. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should propose to the General Assembly that it should decide to defer consideration of agenda item 112 to its resumed forty-seventh session, on the understanding that the working paper prepared by the coordinator would serve as the basis for further negotiations on the question.

112. It was so decided.

113. Mr. DUHALT (Mexico) regretted that no consensus had been reached and that the question had been once again deferred, illustrating how the right of veto implicit in the search for consensus could paralyse the decision-making process. Perhaps it was time to look again at the benefits and drawbacks of that method of taking decisions.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
51st meeting
held on
Sunday, 20 December 1992
at 5 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. DINU	(Romania)
later:	Mr. ZAHID (Vice-Chairman)	(Morocco)
later:	Mr. DINU	(Romania)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 106: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 107: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 103: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: post requirements for 1993 (continued)

Honoraria payable to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations

The contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates

Revised estimates: recosting of decisions of the Fifth Committee

Granting of travel assistance to least developed and other developing countries that are members of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58317 6578S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/47/SR.51
15 January 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 5.55 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 106: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 107: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.25 on improving the financial situation of the United Nations (concerning agenda items 106 and 107)

1. Ms. ERIKSSON-FOGH (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.25, said that it reaffirmed the obligation of all Member States to pay their assessments in full and on time and requested the Secretary-General, in his reports on the financial situation, to include information on arrears and outstanding contributions, on the cash flow situation and on the amounts owed to troop-contributing countries. It further requested the Secretary-General to undertake a study on United Nations financial and budgetary practices and to submit proposals for dealing with cash shortages.

2. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.25 was adopted.

3. Mr. RAE (India), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the understanding that, in accordance with paragraph 3, the Secretary-General would include in his reports information on all arrears and outstanding assessed contributions relating to the regular budget and peace-keeping operations, together with information on amounts owed to troop-contributing countries, and that the Secretary-General would make every effort to recover all outstanding contributions to peace-keeping operations. Information on peace-keeping operations should include information on the United Nations Operation in the Congo and the United Nations Emergency Force in Egypt.

4. Mr. WU Gang (China) said that for years the financial crisis had made the Organization less effective in meeting the increased expectations of the international community. The main cause of the financial crisis was the non-payment of assessed contributions to the regular budget, which forced the Secretary-General to borrow from peace-keeping operation accounts in order to meet operating needs and prevented him from reimbursing troop-contributing countries in a timely manner. His delegation regretted that the draft resolution failed to deal with the regular budget but simply concentrated on peace-keeping operations.

AGENDA ITEM 103: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.17 (concerning agenda items 103 and 104)

5. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco), Vice-Chairman, introducing draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.17, said that the operative part of the draft resolution contained three sections: section I dealt with the development of workload standards and the budgetary presentation of extrabudgetary resources; section II related to the restructuring of the Secretariat and the submission of revised estimates; and section III endorsed the proposed new budget format.

6. Mr. AHMED (Iraq) suggested some editorial changes in the Arabic version of the draft resolution.

7. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that his delegation accepted the arrangements discussed in paragraph 13 on the understanding that the revised estimates for the 1992-1993 programme budget would not exceed the revised appropriations for the biennium.

8. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.17 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.24 on the proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 1994-1995 (concerning agenda item 103)

9. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco), Vice-Chairman, introducing draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.24, said that it followed the previous resolution in form and substance, but that a paragraph on growth had been deemed unnecessary. Paragraph 4 approved the changes in methodology reflected in the Secretary-General's report and paragraph 6 invited the Secretary-General to prepare the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995 on the basis of the preliminary estimate provided by ACABQ.

10. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.24 was adopted.

11. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda), supported by Mr. CHUINKAM (Cameroon), said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that the priorities set by the General Assembly in resolutions 42/253 and 45/255 remained valid.

Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.28 (concerning agenda item 104)

12. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco), Vice-Chairman, said that the text of the draft decision before the Committee represented a consensus.

13. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the words "including the International Civil Service Commission" in the fourth line should be deleted and the words "through the International Civil Service Commission" should be added at the end of the last line.

14. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that, in his view, the amendment suggested by the United States representative would change the substance of the decision. He could accept the addition of the reference to the International Civil Service Commission at the end, but not the deletion of the earlier reference.

15. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco), Vice-Chairman, said it was his understanding that the text as submitted had met the concerns of the United States and the Japanese delegations.

16. Mr. NA CHAPASSAK (Australia) said that his delegation had agreed to the text as submitted and had no problems with its adoption as it stood.

17. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that, as he understood the first three lines of the text, the reference to the International Civil Service Commission was unclear. However, his delegation did not object to the text, although it would prefer other drafting.

18. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) suggested that the third line could be amended to read "taking into account the views of the International Civil Service Commission and the experience of other organizations of the system", while retaining the United States addition at the end of the text.

19. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that, since the Committee was asking about the impact of the budget, perhaps the view of ACABQ should be sought. Avoiding reference to the organizational channel through which the report was to be submitted might make the text simpler. The views of ICSC might best be sought by submitting the report to it.

20. The CHAIRMAN read out the following text of draft decision A/C.5/47/L.28:

> "The General Assembly
>
> "Requests the Secretary-General to review all aspects of the question of staff assessment as they affect the budgets of United Nations organizations and programmes, taking into account the experience of other organizations of the system and established principles and practices, including the principle of ensuring equality of pay and benefits for all staff members, and to present proposals to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session through the International Civil Service Commission."

21. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision as amended.

22. It was so decided.

Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: post requirements for 1993 (continued) (A/C.5/47/7)

23. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the question of post requirements of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) for 1993.

24. Since there were no further comments, he suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it endorse the recommendations of CPC and the Advisory Committee on the 13 posts formerly attached to the subprogrammes of section 15 on trade among countries having different economic and social systems (A/C.5/47/7).

25. It was so decided.

Honoraria payable to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations (A/C.5/47/45)

26. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco), Vice-Chairman, said that, because of a lack of time, he had been unable to hold full informal consultations on the question of honoraria payable to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations. He had held informal consultations with a number of delegations, however, and on the basis of those consultations was submitting the following draft decision:

> "The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it decide to postpone to its resumed session the review of the whole question of honoraria contained in document A/C.5/47/45 and to authorize the Secretary-General to take appropriate discretionary measures, notably with regard to paragraph 55 of his report, within the overall framework of the current pertinent resolutions and decisions."

27. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) said that he fully supported the proposal in substance but would like the word "notably" to be deleted, as it could be misinterpreted to mean that other aspects of honoraria which had not been discussed at all might also be included.

28. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) said that her delegation could agree to postponing that decision but had difficulty in authorizing the Secretary-General to make exceptions.

29. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that the Committee must postpone its decision on the issue as a whole without allowing any exceptions. Should the Secretary-General be authorized to take discretionary measures, a review would have to be carried out to ensure that the measures were within appropriate confines. His delegation would have expected ACABQ to guide the Secretary-General in that respect, but it had not done so.

30. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation would have no difficulty in going along with the Vice-Chairman's proposal, as amended by the Netherlands. While he understood the concerns of the representative of Japan, he assumed that ACABQ would be in a position to oversee those payments.

31. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that, initially, his delegation had had the same misgivings as the Japanese delegation but was willing to give the Secretary-General discretionary powers on the understanding that the Committee would revert to the question of honoraria at the resumed session.

32. Mr. RAE (India) said that if the Committee as a whole decided to adopt the decision read out by the Vice-Chairman, his delegation could go along with it, albeit very reluctantly.

33. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) said that, if there were objections to the second part of the proposal, the text could end with "document A/C.5/47/45".

34. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the proposed decision could take care of the concern of Japan by asking the Secretary-General to report whatever measures he took and to do so in the context of the final programme performance report for 1992-1993. It should be borne in mind that the Committee was not discussing the principles of honoraria payments but was considering the possibility of increasing the rates of such payments in order to compensate for loss in purchasing power.

35. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) suggested that instead of "discretionary measures" the proposal could speak of exceptions to be made, or measures to be taken on an exceptional basis, the procedure to be determined in consultation with ACABQ. That should take care of most delegations' concerns.

36. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) said that her delegation, although uneasy about singling out one paragraph of the report for special treatment, was prepared to join the consensus in order to expedite the Committee's work. She asked other delegations to show the same flexibility on other items.

37. Mr. Zahid (Morocco), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

38. Mr. ACAKPO SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) read out the proposal with the changes suggested in the course of the discussion:

> "The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it decide to postpone to its resumed session the review of the whole question of honoraria contained in document A/C.5/47/45 and to authorize the Secretary-General to take appropriate measures, on an exceptional basis and in consultation with ACABQ, with respect to paragraph 55 of his report, within the overall framework of the current pertinent resolutions and decisions. It further recommends that the Secretary-General reflect the measures he will take in the final performance report for the biennium 1992-1993."

39. Mr. RAE (India) found the reference to consultations with ACABQ somewhat vague. Would they be with the ACABQ secretariat, with the Chairman or with the whole membership?

40. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that his delegation could not accept such an ambiguous interpretation; ACABQ was a collegial body and not reducible to its secretariat or its Chairman. Moreover, the words "with the concurrence of ACABQ" would be more appropriate than "in consultation with ACABQ", when authorizing the Secretary-General to commit resources.

41. The discussion was in any case untimely, since the review of the question of honoraria was being postponed. There was no reason for ACABQ to be singled out for special treatment over and above such bodies as the Administrative Tribunal. Indeed, it was debatable whether the question of reimbursement of airfares for spouses was relevant to the question of honoria. He did not believe that it was, although he agreed that the duration of the Advisory Committee's sessions was a matter of concern, since it met for nearly eight months a year. A shorter meeting schedule ought to be considered.

42. His delegation was uneasy with the nebulous proposal that had been put forward, but would not oppose it if it could incorporate the following changes. The words "in consultation with" should be replaced by "with the concurrence of"; the second sentence should begin "Pending completion of the review, ..."; and a third sentence should be added reading: "It further decides to revert to the matter again at its forty-eighth session."

43. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the wording proposed by the representative of Japan did not substantially modify the original proposal, which would give temporary authority to the Secretary-General to implement paragraph 55. He would prefer to retain the words "in consultation with", which merely implied that the Secretary-General would ascertain which members would be attending the session and travelling with their spouses, but could reluctantly accept the proposed "with the concurrence of".

44. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt the Vice-Chairman's proposed decision as read out by the Secretary of the Committee and further modified by the representative of Japan.

45. It was so decided.

The contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates (A/C.5/47/85)

46. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was recommending acceptance of the proposals in document A/C.5/47/85. After the proposed action, the Secretary-General indicated in paragraph 3 that there would remain a balance of $11.7 million in the contingency fund. However, during the consideration of the item, the Committee had been informed that an amount of

(Mr. Mselle)

$5.3 million was not included in the balance. That amount represented the cost estimates of some programme budget implications which the Committee had decided to refer to the resumed forty-seventh session of the General Assembly in early 1993 and which related mainly to institutional arrangements for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and Department of Public Information offices. So far, all the actions taken by the General Assembly which were governed by the procedures for the use and operation of the contingency fund, as determined by the Secretary-General, had been accommodated in the contingency fund.

47. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said his delegation was not surprised that a substantial balance had been left in the contingency fund, since most of the budget add-ons were to be financed out of the contingency fund. His delegation wished to know how much the Committee had approved in terms of programme budget implications or revised estimates that would not be charged to the contingency fund. With reference to the comprehensive study of the question of honoraria payable to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations referred to in the annex to document A/C.5/47/85, it was his delegation's understanding that there had been no formal decision to approve the amount of $46,000 indicated; it therefore assumed that that particular reference was not correct. However, it had no objection of principle to the appropriation.

48. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said his delegation was conscious that there were substantial additional charges which could potentially be made against the contingency fund for the current biennium and that some major items of expenditure were being treated as unforeseen and extraordinary and were, at least arguably, a legitimate charge to the contingency fund. His delegation was not convinced that major maintenance was any different in qualitative terms from construction. When a charge that represented a major item of building expenditure arose in the course of a biennium, the cost of that repair should be weighed against the other requirements placed upon the Organization in terms of expenditure available. The precise expenditures which his delegation had in mind in that connection related to the relatively inexpensive modification of meeting rooms to accommodate the increased number of Member States and the relatively more expensive repair to the structure which overhung the FDR Drive. The City of New York had closed off a ramp leading to the FDR Drive which had remained closed for a number of years, presumably because its repair was not among the City's priorities. That was a legitimate example of budgetary prioritization, and it seemed to his delegation that the United Nations would do well to adopt a similar approach. In any event, the matter deserved very careful consideration in the context of the next review of the procedures for the use and operation of the contingency fund at the forty-eighth session.

49. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) sought clarification on what action would be taken with respect to the $5.3 million.

50. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the representative of Canada, said that the contingency fund technically covered three years: the first year in which the budget was prepared; the first year of the biennium; and the second year of the biennium. The $5.3 million, which represented programme budget implications to be taken up at the resumed forty-seventh session, would be charged to the balance of the contingency fund. There would be a crisis if more programme budget implications came up between 1 January and 31 December 1993. If that should happen, the General Assembly would decide how to proceed; but for the time being the $5.3 million requirement could be covered by the contingency fund.

51. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that his delegation had been given assurances by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management and the Acting Controller that the level of the revised estimates which would be presented in 1993 would not exceed the revised appropriations to be adopted within the next few days. In other words, the $5.3 million would not be automatically charged to the contingency fund. Indeed, his delegation expected the Secretary-General to absorb costs wherever possible through the internal redeployment of resources.

52. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that it was not yet possible to predict whether the contingency fund would be sufficient for the biennium. His delegation took note of what the representative of Japan had said with regard to the $5.3 million and was waiting to see how the situation unfolded at the resumed session before taking a firm decision.

53. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation agreed in principle with the position taken by the United Kingdom delegation regarding charges for major maintenance against the contingency fund and believed that such charges were appropriate. With respect to the structure which overhung the FDR Drive, if he had understood the position of the United Kingdom delegation correctly, it believed that the cost of repairs should be paid by the City of New York. He was not aware of what had transpired at the ACABQ meeting at which the issue had been discussed. However, he was under the impression that, legally, the United Nations was required to pay those costs. If, in fact, that was not the case, then his delegation would encourage the Legal Counsel to take the matter up with the City.

54. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said he had not suggested that New York City was responsible for the repairs. He had merely drawn a comparison between the City's practice and that of the United Nations with respect to budgetary prioritization when it came to repairing roadways.

55. Mr. BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that the add-ons outside the contingency fund amounted to approximately $14.7 million. He had taken note of the second point made by the representative of the United States. The Secretariat's statement on the revised budget appropriations for 1992-1993

(Mr. Baudot)

referred to the restructuring and assumed that the General Assembly would take a decision on other revised estimates or programme budget implications not related to restructuring. As the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had indicated, there were a number of instances in which the General Assembly had decided on amounts that were smaller than those proposed by the Secretary-General and the unutilized balance of the contingency fund would be available during 1993.

56. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee, in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 42/211, should recommend to the Assembly the appropriation of the required amounts, i.e. $3,483,400, under the relevant sections of the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993, as distributed in paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/47/85, and furthermore, that the Committee should also inform the Assembly to take note that a balance of $11,753,700 would remain in the contingency fund.

57. It was so decided.

Revised estimates: recosting of decisions of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/47/86)

58. Mr. ACAKPO SATCHIVI (Secretary to the Committee) drew attention to an error in document A/C.5/47/86: on page 2, the increase or decrease should be in United States dollars, not thousands of United States dollars.

59. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should approve, following the recosting of decisions of the Fifth Committee concerning statements of programme budget implications and revised estimates as contained in document A/C.5/47/86, a net increase of $121,300 for the biennium 1992-1993.

60. It was so decided.

Granting of travel assistance to least developed and other developing countries that are members of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (continued)

61. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to postpone to its resumed session the discussion of travel expenses for members of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law from least developed and other developing countries.

62. It was so decided.

63. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation would be willing to accept, on an exceptional basis, payment of the travel costs of certain delegations attending the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), provided that agreement could be reached on another proposal, namely for limits on the terms of high-level United Nations

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

officials. His delegation reserved the right to revert to that proposal at the resumed session in the course of further discussions on other outstanding issues addressed under agenda item 104, including standards of accommodation for air travel (A/C.5/47/17) and costs of staff representation activities (A/C.5/47/59).

64. Mr. Dinu (Romania) resumed the Chair.

65. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) regretted that no decision had been made with regard to travel expenditures for UNCITRAL. However, he appreciated the flexibility shown by delegations and hoped that at the resumed session the Committee could reach consensus on a positive decision.

The meeting rose at 8.40 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
52nd meeting
held on
Monday, 21 December 1992
at 6 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DINU (Romania)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 124: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 103: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 103: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) RESPECT FOR THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 111: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58323 6580S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/47/SR.52
19 January 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 124: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.19

1. Mr. MERRIFIELD (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Chairman, said that lengthy informal consultations has led to a consensus text which had led to a consensus text which he hoped the Committee could adopt without a vote. The operative portion of the draft text had been divided into four parts, the first of which determined the groups of countries into which the newest States Members of the United Nations were to be placed for the purpose of financing peace-keeping operations. With regard to the second part, he stressed that the delegations which had participated in the informal consultations were adamant that the wording agreed at that time should be retained. Accordingly, the phrase "into groups" in the sole operative paragraph should be revised to read "into the groups", and the reference to the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly in the same paragraph should read "forty-eighth regular session".

2. Draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.19, as orally revised, was adopted.

3. Mr. RANDRIAMALALA (Madagascar) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, albeit with reservations. The draft text did not correct any of the anomalies recognized by the General Assembly. In particular, it failed to take into account the situation of the countries listed in paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolutin 46/246. Those States were being penalized by the fact that their inclusion in the list of least developed countries continued to be postponed.

4. Mr. RAE (India), supported by Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) and Mr. BARIMANI (Islamic Republic of Iran), said that although his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, it believed that the existing arrangements for the financing of peace-keeping operations, referred to in part II of the draft resolution, had served the Organization well for 20 years and, while ad hoc in nature, ought to be institutionalized. The mandate of the Committee's open-ended working group had been limited to investigating discrepancies in the placement of some States in the groups established under those arrangements.

5. Mr. CARDOSO (Brazil) said that his delegation, too, had joined in the consensus, and believed that the existing arrangements recognized the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council, while reflecting the effective capacity to pay of all Member States, something which was not always taken into account in the regular budget.

AGENDA ITEM 103: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.31

6. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph (b) (iii) should be deleted from the text of the draft decision.

7. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that, although the report referred to in paragraph (c) (v) had been requested, it had never been issued. He suggested that the words "(not yet issued)" should be added after the title of the report.

8. Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.31, as amended, was adopted.

9. Mr. CLAVIJO (Colombia) said that in his delegation's view, although the Committee had taken note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on extrabudgetary resources of the United Nations (A/45/797), that did not mean that the report had been duly considered during the current session; his delegation hoped that the substance of the report would be considered, if possible at the next session of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 103: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

Biennial programme of work of the Committee for 1993-1994 (A/C.5/47/L.30)

10. The CHAIRMAN recalled that in 1991 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 46/220 concerning the rationalization of the work of the Fifth Committee. In paragraph 6 of that resolution, the Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Committee for consideration and approval each year a proposed biennial programme of work, taking into account relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly of that year. In that connection, he drew attention to draft decision A/C.5/47/L.30, containing the biennial programme of work of the Committee for 1993-1994.

11. Mr. LÄHDEVIRTH (Finland) said that the items in document A/C.5/47/L.30 did not appear to be fully consistent with General Assembly resolution 46/220. He was surprised, for example, to note that the item on the Joint Inspection Unit had been included in the programme of work for both 1993 and 1994, as it was his understanding that the item was to be considered only in odd years.

12. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) recalled that the Committee had decided to defer the item on personnel questions to the Assembly's resumed session in 1993; he wondered, however, what action the Committee should take if it could not reach a consensus on the draft decision.

13. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) recalled the Committee's decision to consider the item on the United Nations common system each year in connection with proposals concerning base floor for salary scale adjustments and other ad hoc exceptions to the general programme of biennialization. The Committee would need to consider the United Nations pension system in 1993, at least in so far as amendments to the Pension Fund Regulations were concerned. Such amendments were the necessary outcome of the comprehensive review of General Service pensionable remuneration and must be adopted at the forty-eighth session if the new system was to enter into force on 1 January 1994. He further recalled that resolution 46/220 provided for ad hoc exceptions to the general pattern; presumably, the programme of work could be adjusted on the basis of proposals from the Secretary-General through the General Committee should developments so require prior to the opening of the forty-eighth session.

14. Mr. CLAVIJO (Colombia) said that the subtitle of document A/C.5/47/L.30 might give rise to confusion, since the Committee would consider 1992 items during 1993. He wondered whether it might not be preferable to refer to the programme of work for the forty-eighth session rather than for 1993-1994.

15. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee), replying to the questions raised by the representatives of Finland and Morocco, said that document A/C.5/47/L.30 took account not only of the programme of work proposed in General Assembly resolution 46/220, but also of the resolutions and decisions adopted at the current session. Since the Committee had decided to consider the items on the United Nations pension system and common system in 1993, and had requested annual reports on the Joint Inspection Unit, the Secretariat had had little choice but to include those items in the programme of work.

16. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that while he appreciated the explanation given by the Secretary of the Committee, he wondered whether document A/C.5/47/L.30 was necessary, since General Assembly resolution 46/220 remained valid. If the document was to be retained, he suggested that the item on the United Nations pension system should be added to the programme of work for 1993 and that the item on the Joint Inspection Unit should be deleted therefrom, as it would conflict with draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.10, which the Committee had recommended for adoption by the General Assembly.

17. Mr. ACAKPO-SATCHIVI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the proposal made by the Colombian representative would be taken into account when the document was finalized.

18. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft decision A/C.5/47/L.30, as orally amended by the United Kingdom representative, without a vote.

19. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 112: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) RESPECT FOR THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS (continued)

20. The CHAIRMAN said that the question of whether respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations should henceforth be considered as a separate agenda item had been discussed in informal consultations. While there had been general agreement that the current sub-item could indeed be converted into a separate agenda item, there had been no agreement as to which Main Committee (the Fifth or the Sixth) should deal with the item. Accordingly, it had been agreed that the Committee should revert to the matter at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly. He took it that the Committee wished to proceed accordingly.

21. Mr. DJACTA (Algeria) said that, as his delegation had had no prior knowledge of the question, it would be unable to take a decision at the current meeting; it preferred, however, to retain the question as a sub-item.

22. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) suggested that the Committee could consider the question at the resumed forty-seventh session.

23. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) said that while he had no difficulty with the previous speaker's proposal, he failed to see the need for further discussion on the subject.

24. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that a decision to defer consideration of the status of the sub-item to the forty-eighth session was not consistent with the Committee's adoption, earlier in the meeting, of its programme of work. He urged, therefore, that it should be considered at the resumed forty-seventh session.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the views expressed, he took it that the Committee wished to revert to the question of whether or not the current sub-item should be transformed into a separate agenda item at the resumed forty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

26. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 111: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29

27. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados), introducing the draft decision, said that the informal consultations had failed to reach consensus on the decision. In particular, during the current assessment period, two Member States had had their rates of assessment adjusted and those States, together with the

(Mr. Maycock, Barbados)

successor State to a former Member State, each had specific interests to protect, which had had indirect repercussions for all Member States. Various compromise solutions had been attempted, some of which had resulted in assessment scales which fell short of 100 per cent of the budget and were therefore regarded as unacceptable by certain delegations. In addition, the Secretariat had indicated that it would have difficulties with such a solution. Two options resulting in 100 per cent scales had been explored; one had finally been rejected, while the other was contained in draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.22, prepared in a final attempt to break the deadlock.

28. Although a number of delegations were unhappy with the arrangements proposed, they appeared to be the only means of ensuring that a scale of assessments would be established in 1992. He therefore recommended draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 for adoption by the Committee.

29. Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine), referring to draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29, said that the Legal Counsel, in his statement at the 38th meeting, had indicated that the Committee on Contributions had recommended erroneous treatment of Belarus and Ukraine and that the adoption of their recommended rates of assessment, as contained in the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/47/11, paras. 58-59), would not be consistent with rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The recommendations constituted a revision of General Assembly resolution 46/221, which had been adopted by consensus, and a recorded vote would have to be taken on the draft decision. The Committee on Contributions had had no mandate to propose the increase in question; the rules on the scheme of limits had not been applied, to name just one example of mismanagement and improper action. It was not in the interest of the United Nations to adopt a decision that was not legally valid.

30. Ukraine, which - together with Belarus - had experienced the Chernobyl catastrophe, could not pay a higher rate. Belarus and Ukraine understood that numerous factors needed to be taken into account and that many changes had taken place, including the dissolution of the Soviet Union. However, the Soviet Union's seat at the United Nations had been taken over by a country that had undertaken at the time to honour all the Soviet Union's obligations, including its financial obligations. Unfortunately, the financial obligations of that former super-Power had had to be assumed disproportionately by Belarus, Ukraine and 12 other countries. Moreover, those financial obligations were not offset by any corresponding advantages.

31. In a memorandum dated 11 December 1992 addressed to the Secretary-General, Belarus and Ukraine had made the following points: the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions set out in its report had been adopted in violation of the principle of equality of all Member States and, contrary to existing procedures and practice, envisaged a discriminatory increase of more than 50 per cent in the contributions of Belarus and Ukraine to the budget; Belarus and Ukraine were perplexed by their inclusion in the report in the category of new Member States, and by the subsequent

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

inappropriate and unjustified actions to determine their new financial obligations to the United Nations; there could be no valid explanation for the recommendation by the Committee on Contributions that the rates of assessment for 1993 and 1994 should be 0.48 per cent in the case of Belarus and 1.87 per cent in the case of Ukraine, since the Committee on Contributions was in any event not authorized to take such action; the financial obligations of Belarus and Ukraine to the United Nations had already been assessed, as determined by the scale of assessments for 1992, 1993 and 1994, which had been adopted in General Assembly resolution 46/221; Belarus and Ukraine regarded the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions, as set out in its report, as inappropriate, and had instructed their delegations to oppose their adoption; they suggested that at the current session the General Assembly should confirm the scale of assessments that it had adopted at its forty-sixth session, and determine the contributions to be made by new Member States in accordance with the existing rules. Before the issue of the scale of assessments was taken up again, consultations could be held among interested parties to ensure adoption of the scale by consensus.

32. Ukraine called on the Committee not to adopt draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 and requested a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.22.

33. Mr. SUGANO (Japan), referring to draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.22 and draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29, asked which of the two drafts the Committee would take action on first.

34. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados) said that the Committee should first take action on the draft decision. Depending on the outcome of its consideration of the draft decision, the Committee might or might not be able to take action on the draft resolution at the current meeting.

35. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 had been submitted prior to draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.22. As far as procedure was concerned, he was suggesting that the Committee should take action on the draft decision first and then, as proposed by the representative of Barbados, decide whether action on the draft resolution was necessary. He had originally planned to take up the draft resolution at the current meeting on the assumption that it would be adopted by consensus; moreover, since the Committee was supposed to have completed its work by 18 December, many delegations had asked him to expedite the remaining substantive business at the current meeting so that they could report back to their Governments. However, the statement just made by the representative of the Ukraine made it clear that a consensus on the draft resolution was unlikely. It would therefore be more appropriate to act on the draft decision first and then decide how to proceed.

36. Mr. YEGOROV (Belarus) expressed appreciation to the representative of Barbados for his intensive efforts to guide the very complex negotiations on the item under consideration. Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 summed up the

(Mr. Yegorov, Belarus)

content of those negotiations. His delegation was deeply concerned that, those efforts notwithstanding, it had not been possible to reach a consensus on an issue that was vital to the United Nations. It could not support the draft decision, which represented a complete break with existing practice and violated fundamental principles and criteria and rules of procedure for assessing Member States' contributions.

37. The draft decision was based entirely on the recommendations of the fifty-second session of the Committee on Contributions. The report of the Committee on Contributions to the current session of the General Assembly stated clearly that the Committee had considered the issue in accordance with paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 46/221 A and with rule 160 of the rules of procedure. However, his delegation felt that the Committee on Contributions had not been guided by those provisions and that, in deciding to revise the assessments of the Ukraine and Belarus and to recommend that they be increased by over 50 per cent, it had taken a legally unjustified step that exceeded its competence as a technical subsidiary organ of the General Assembly. The Legal Counsel, in his opinion, had noted that the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions breached the provisions of both General Assembly resolution 46/221 A and rule 160 of the rules of procedure. When asked whether the General Assembly at its current session could revise the rates for Belarus and Ukraine despite the existence of fundamental principles and consensus decisions on that issue, the Legal Counsel had recommended against any such change, on the grounds that it would create a very dangerous precedent and give rise to financial and technical problems. He had also said that it would be discriminatory and selective to use a majority of votes to overrule important provisions of the Charter and the rules of procedure, criteria and consensus resolutions of the General Assembly. Such a situation might lead to a violation of the principles of international law and of the law of international organizations.

38. The Fifth Committee and the General Assembly as a whole should not simply rubber stamp recommendations submitted to them by technical subsidiary organs but should consider them in their broader political context. The time had come for the General Assembly to provide new guidelines to the Committee on Contributions to ensure that it took account of the complex political, social, economic and legal aspects of the assessment of contributions. The Committee on Contributions should help the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly to apply fundamental principles while taking fair account of the interests of all Member States.

39. His delegation would vote against the draft decision and reserved the right to explain its vote in the plenary Assembly. The Fifth Committee and the General Assembly should not rush to take action on the issue and his delegation therefore urged other delegations not to vote for the draft decision.

40. Mr. INOMATA (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his Government had great sympathy for the economic and other difficulties facing the States of the former Soviet Union and regretted that the efforts to reach a consensus on draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 had been unsuccessful. Nevertheless, his delegation recognized that the only solution at the current juncture was to adopt the recommendations by the Committee on Contributions and, therefore, supported the draft decision under consideration.

41. Ms. SIMONE (Armenia) expressed her country's great disappointment that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus on the scale of assessments and deeply regretted that the matter had to be put to a vote. Armenia had no alternative but to vote against the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions.

42. The break-up of the Soviet Union had left in its wake enormously complex problems for Armenia and the other Republics concerned as they made the transition to a market economy. Armenia had declared itself to be in a state of national emergency; and shortages of food, medicine and fuel had left the population struggling for its very survival. In spite of all that, her country remained committed to the ideals of democracy and a free market economy.

43. Unfortunately, there did not appear to have been sufficient political will to solve the problem of the scale of assessments. Armenia had participated in the discussion because it wanted to be fairly assessed on the basis of its own national accounts information. It was also a question of the right of a number of the newly independent States to be treated as equal members in the United Nations system as well as respect for national sovereignty. Unfortunately, the rights of the 14 newly independent States conflicted with the interests of a few. Under the terms of the draft decision in question, her country's true independence in the United Nations system would be delayed. Nevertheless, whatever decision was taken by the General Assembly regarding the scale of assessments, Armenia would fulfil its obligations.

44. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) said it was unfortunate that in the time available, the attempt to balance interests and reach a consensus on the scale of assessments had not been successful. From the very beginning, Canada had felt uncomfortable with the procedures put forward by the Committee on Contributions. While not binding, the opinion provided by the Legal Counsel to the Committee merited respect and consideration. It was clear from that opinion that in adopting draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29, the Fifth Committee was being asked to act contrary to rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and that the manner in which the recommendations were put forward by the Committee on Contributions was legally untenable. Delegations should consider the precedent-setting effect of the adoption of the draft resolution, which Canada was not in a position to support.

45. Mr. LUEDIG (Estonia) said that throughout the discussion on the scale of assessments his country had only wanted to be treated like other Member States, without continuing to bear the burden of the former Soviet Union. In putting draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 to a vote, the Committee was allowing one Member State to exercise a veto through its delegation's unwillingness to take into account the interests of other delegations and reach a consensus solution in which the concerns of that delegation could still have been met. The approach by the Committee on Contributions to distribute rather than calculate the assessments would place a burden on Estonian citizens that was beyond their capacity to assume. At a time when the Committee on Contributions was asking the newly independent States to shoulder a major burden regarding the excessive political debt of the former Soviet Union, schools, hospitals and homes throughout Estonia would not be heated because no one could afford to purchase fuel oil. If the draft decision was adopted, Estonia, nevertheless, would continue to work within the system and appeal to the Committee on Contributions in accordance with rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

46. Mr. MIHAI (Romania) said that, unfortunately, a consensus could have been reached only through a political solution that was well beyond the limited technical competence of the Committee on Contributions. Romania was unhappy that a political solution to deal with the extraordinary circumstances of the situation at hand had not been found and would abstain in the vote on the draft decision. It was hoped that in future, the Committee on Contributions and the Fifth Committee would find appropriate ways to address the legitimate concerns raised by the newly independent States.

47. Mr. SUZIEDELIS (Lithuania) said that his country would vote against draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 for the reasons that it had stated in previous discussions of the item and reserved the right to express its views on the matter in plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

48. Mr. NOVRUZOV (Azerbaijan) said that, like the previous speaker, his delegation also wished to reserve the right to express its views on the question in plenary meeting of the General Assembly. In spite of the enormous efforts made to achieve a result acceptable to all the Republics of the former Soviet Union, the position of one delegation had made it impossible to reach a consensus on the scale of assessments. It was hoped that future cooperation would lead to more fruitful results.

49. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar,

Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

Against: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine.

Abstaining: Algeria, Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, France, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, Israel, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Maldives, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovenia.

50. Draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 was adopted by 62 votes to 15, with 19 abstentions.

51. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation understood the position of those Member States that had deemed it necessary to oppose the adoption of draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29. At the same time, the United Nations had to adopt a scale of assessment that was acceptable to the majority of Members of the Organization. Nevertheless, rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly provided for appeals by Members for a change of assessments. It was unfortunate that none of the various compromise proposals put forward in the informal consultations had been able to command the necessary measure of agreement. He deeply regretted that the vote on the draft decision represented the first departure since the forty-third session of the General Assembly from the practice of reaching a consensus on questions relating to the regular budget. That departure, however, had come about under the special circumstances resulting from the admission of a large number of new Member States following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. His delegation hoped that in time all the legitimate concerns of those States could be accommodated and believed that the Committee must strive to reach the broadest possible agreement on the issues on its agenda. That approach strengthened the United Nations and was to the collective benefit of its Members.

52. Mr. KARBUCZKY (Hungary) said that although the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions represented a bad solution, the alternatives were even more painful. His delegation had hoped that the Fifth Committee would not approach the question of the scale of assessments on purely technical grounds, but would consider the moral and political aspects. It was regrettable that short-term fiscal considerations had generally prevailed and that a number of Member States were unfairly burdened. Such short-sighted decisions did not solve problems and jeopardized the stability of the Organization. Accordingly, his delegation had been unable to support the draft decision and firmly believed that the situation facing the newly independent States concerned should be rectified no later than 1994. A fair

(Mr. Karbuczky, Hungary)

solution could be found on the basis of broader equitable sharing of the surplus of the assessment of the former Soviet Union. The Committee on Contributions should play a key role in bringing about a general solution to the problem.

53. Mr. PENEV (Bulgaria) said that the task confronting the Committee on Contributions had been truly unprecedented. His delegation had stressed the need to reach a consensus and deeply regretted the fact that the constructive efforts by all Member States had not led to a generally accepted text. It was essential to maintain the practice followed in recent years of taking decisions on budgetary and administrative questions on the basis of consensus, particularly with regard to the scale of assessments. The draft decision just adopted would have a negative impact on the confidence of Member States in the proper application of the capacity-to-pay principle as well as the general principle of equity in sharing the financial requirements of the Organization. For those reasons, his delegation, after very careful consideration, had found it appropriate to abstain in the vote.

54. Mr. CHUINKAM (Cameroon) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision in view of the need for a scale of assessments for 1993, it regretted that, in spite of the considerable efforts made, a consensus had not been achieved.

55. Mr. KOCATÜRK (Turkey) said that his delegation, which always supported the principle of consensus, had voted against the draft decision. Turkey's position was one of principle and he fully shared the views expressed by the representative of Canada.

56. Mr. MÜNCH (Germany) said that his delegation, like that of the United Kingdom, had expressed understanding for the difficulties confronting the newly independent States of the former Soviet Union. Nevertheless, while some of the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions could be regarded as questionable, in view of the failure to reach a consensus there had been no alternative to the adoption of those recommendations. The vote just taken should remain an exception and the practice of consensus should be adhered to in the Fifth Committee.

57. Ms. MEYER (New Zealand) said that her delegation was deeply disappointed that it had not been possible to arrive at a consensus on the scale of assessments. She had voted against the draft decision on the grounds that paragraphs 51 to 64 of the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/47/11) represented unfinished business. The Committee on Contributions should be requested to resume its work in that regard as soon as possible. In that connection, she stressed the need to find a just solution acceptable to all Member States. In reaching its decision on the matter, her delegation had been mindful of the need to give weight to the opinion provided by the Legal Counsel and felt that it was not desirable for the Fifth Committee to recommend that the General Assembly should not follow its own rules of procedure.

58. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) said that his country, which would have preferred to reach a consensus on the question of the scale of assessments, respected the views of those delegations which were directly concerned and which had not supported the draft decision. The Netherlands had participated actively in the negotiation process and had been prepared to consider burden-sharing arrangements. While his delegation regretted the departure from the practice of reaching a consensus, it also believed that that step was the result of extraordinary circumstances.

59. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) said that the draft decision under consideration was the best possible solution to a difficult situation. The failure to reach a consensus in spite of the great efforts made was regrettable and should not constitute a precedent changing the Committee's practice of following the principle of consensus.

60. Miss SHITAKHA (Kenya) said that her delegation, which as a matter of principle tended to support the recommendations of expert committees, had voted in favour of the draft decision. Nevertheless, Kenya regretted that the Committee on Contributions had felt that it was necessary to assess Belarus and Ukraine as new Member States. The Commitee on Contributions had erred in its treatment of those States, in total disregard for well-defined rules. In that connection, she fully supported the comments made by the representative of Canada on the opinion provided by the Legal Counsel. It was hoped that Belarus and Ukraine would be given the opportunity to present their cases before the Committee on Contributions at its next session and that their presentations would be given the serious consideration that they deserved.

61. Mr. ELZIMAITY (Egypt) commended the efforts made to reach a consensus on the question under consideration and reaffirmed his delegation's commitment to the principles guiding the financing of the Organization's work as the collective responsibility of the Member States to assume the financial burden involved in accordance with the real capacity of each Member State to pay contributions.

62. Ms. ERIKSSON FOGH (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, expressed deep regret that it had not been possible to reach a consensus on the question under consideration. The Nordic countries had voted against draft decision A/C.5/47/L.29 because the General Assembly should have demonstrated the necessary political will to address with the seriousness that it deserved the question of the rates of assessment for the Baltic States and those of the Commonwealth of Independent States. During the deliberations in the Fifth Committee, the limitations of the current methodology for dealing with that situation had become very clear. Given the necessary political will, it would have been possible to arrive at an agreement mandating the Committee on Contributions to review the question in order to reach a solution based on fairness and equitable burden-sharing. The Nordic countries reaffirmed their confidence in the Committee on Contributions and its status as an expert body.

(Ms. Eriksson Fogh, Sweden)

63. It was hoped that the discussions at the current session of the General Assembly would provide the Committee on Contributions with clear political guidance for its next session. She urged that Committee to bear in mind rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly when it considered the rates of assessment of the Baltic States and those of the Commonwealth of Independent States. The Nordic countries reaffirmed their commitment to the principle of consensus on issues related to the programme budget and the financing of the Organization. The vote just taken was an exception resulting from an unusual situation and should not create a precedent for future deliberations.

64. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision because there was no viable alternative to the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions. The adoption of the draft decision, however, should not prevent the newly independent States that so wished from appealing to the Committee on Contributions for changes in their rates of assessment.

65. Mr. DUHALT (Mexico) said that his delegation profoundly regretted the fact that it had been impossible to reach a consensus on the draft decision in spite of the considerable efforts made. While Mexico understood the serious difficulties which the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions would cause for some Member States, it considered that, under current circumstances, those recommendations constituted the only viable and technically sound solution to a very complex problem. His country, therefore, had voted in favour of the draft decision on the understanding that the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions represented an unavoidable transitional step and that the rates of assessment could be adjusted in future as provided for in paragraph 70 of the Committee's report (A/47/11). It was hoped that future rates of assessment for all Member States would be determined on the basis of reliable, verifiable and comparable data.

66. Mr. RAE (India) expressed regret that it had been impossible to reach a consensus in view of the complexity of the issue and the limited time available. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision, which, albeit flawed, was the only realistic approach.

67. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) expressed his delegation's deep regret that it had been necessary to put the draft decision to a vote. Ghana had voted in favour of the draft decision with great reluctance. Belarus and Ukraine were not new Member States and therefore should not be treated on that basis. While appreciating the difficulties encountered by the Committee on Contributions in dealing with the statistical data on those two countries, he stressed the need to adhere to the principle of the capacity of Member States to pay. Ghana had voted in favour of the draft decision because, under the circumstances, there was no viable alternative. His delegation had sought to serve the higher interests of the Organization and had cast its vote on the understanding that the Committee on Contributions could consider appeals from the Member States

(Mr. Dankwa, Ghana)

concerned and might decide to adjust their rates of assessment in the preparation of the next scale of assessments.

68. Mr. BEN HAMIDA (Tunisia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision but would have preferred to see a consensus because of its belief in the need to respect the principles of collective responsibility for financial matters and the real capacity to pay of Member States. It was, however, convinced that the Committee on Contributions should continue its efforts to correct current imbalances, taking account of the information provided to it by the Member States concerned.

69. Mr. GIUFFRIDA (Italy) deeply regretted the outcome of discussions on the item under consideration. His delegation recognized the difficult situation of the former Soviet republics and hoped to see agreement on a fair assessment of their contributions to the Organization in the near future.

70. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) said that she, like the representative of the United Kingdom, considered it unfortunate that a vote had been taken on such an important decision. Not all Member States had displayed the flexibility in terms of sharing burdens which would have been required to achieve a consensus. Her delegation thus had no alternative but to support the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions. Member States should, however, exercise their rights under rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

71. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) affirmed his delegation's strong belief in the principle whereby decisions of a financial and budgetary nature, including the scale of assessments, should be adopted by consensus whenever possible. It understood the complexities and positions of principle involved in the issue under consideration and took particular note of the legal opinion expressed with respect to Belarus and Ukraine. However, it had voted in favour of the draft decision because it felt that agreement on a scale of assessments could not be further delayed, thus endorsing a constructive decision based on the only option available. It hoped that the decision would be the subject of further review by the Committee on Contributions.

72. Mr. TEIRLINCK (Belgium) said that his delegation fully endorsed the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom. It understood the economic difficulties faced by new Member States and hoped that the vote which had just taken place would prove to be as exceptional as the circumstances which had given rise to it.

73. Mr. ONWUALIA (Nigeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision because it felt, regrettably, that it had no other option. However, it hoped that the Committee on Contributions would produce more satisfactory solutions when it next met to consider the issue.

74. Mr. CARDOSO (Brazil) said that his delegation, when voting in favour of the draft decision, had been responding, in the absence of a consensus, to the need to ensure a means by which the Organization might apportion its expenditure among all Member States within prevailing time constraints.

75. Mr. TANG Guangting (China), while deeply regretting the failure to achieve consensus, was of the view that the Organization must have a scale of assessments for the coming year, particularly in view of the financial difficulties which it faced. Given the limited time available, his delegation had had no option but to vote in favour of the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions. It hoped that the Committee on Contributions would further investigate the situation of the countries concerned, with a view to elaborating a more just and reasonable scale at the earliest opportunity, and that the Fifth Committee would continue to seek solutions in a spirit of consensus.

76. Mr. DJACTA (Algeria) hoped that the failure to achieve a consensus would not be repeated in future. His delegation had abstained from the vote because it considered the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions to be unsatisfactory. It appealed to the Committee to take account of the difficult economic situation of certain Member States and to ensure compliance with the principle whereby scales of assessments should be based on capacity to pay.

77. Mr. BAUMANIS (Latvia) reserved the right of his delegation to explain, in plenary meeting, its vote against the draft decision.

78. Mr. BIRAUD (France) regretted that it had proved impossible to achieve the same spirit of consensus and equitable sharing of burdens as had prevailed at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/221. All delegations, including his own, bore some responsibility for the fact that a vote had been taken. It was all the more unfortunate, given the great efforts expended in informal consultations, that the vote had been taken on the least imaginative text.

79. His delegation had abstained because to vote in favour would mean placing a heavy and perhaps lasting burden on certain new republics of the former Soviet Union. A vote in favour also implied disregard for the opinion expressed by the Legal Counsel. A vote against the draft decision, on the other hand, would have represented an attack on the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions, which had done its best in exceptional circumstances. It would also have demanded an inordinate effort on the part of the Russian Federation, since the former Soviet Union was the first to suffer the effects of the scheme of limits. Above all, his delegation believed that the absence, even temporarily, of an assessment for some Member States would have detracted from their full participation in the work of the Organization.

80. The CHAIRMAN recalled the earlier statement by the representative of Barbados to the effect that a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/47/L.22 might not be required at the current stage of proceedings. In light of some of the statements made during discussion of the draft decision contained in document A/C.5/47/L.29, he proposed that no action be taken on the draft resolution during the current meeting.

81. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 10.40 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
53rd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 22 December 1992
at 11 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DINU (Romania)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

AGENDA ITEM 111: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58329 6565S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/47/SR.53
8 January 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 12.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 104: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued) (A/C.5/47/L.20)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/47/L.20)

1. Mr. OSELLA (Argentina), Rapporteur, introducing document A/C.5/47/L.20, noted that section II summarized the actions taken by the Fifth Committee during its current session broken down by section of the budget with an indication of their effect on the approved programme budget for the current biennium. In total, those actions had resulted in net increases of $78,804,300 in the approved level of appropriations and net increases of $21,803,100 in the approved estimates of income. Section IV contained the recommendations of the Fifth Committee, consisting of draft resolutions I and II and draft decisions I, II and III.

2. Under part A of draft resolution II, the General Assembly would resolve that the amount of the initial appropriation, $2,389,234,900, would be increased by $78,804,300 to a total of $2,468,039,200. Under part B of draft resolution II the total income approved by the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session, $449,213,300, would be increased by $21,803,100 to a total of $471,016,400. Part C of draft resolution II provided for an assessment on Member States for the year 1993 of $1,233,245,435 before the application of credits for staff assessment or of $1,015,204,535 net of staff assessment.

3. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) asked whether it was not usual to include in the Committee's report a list of the items on which the Committee had decided, without a vote, to recommend that the General Assembly appropriate the required amounts.

4. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom) said it did not speak well for the seriousness of the Committee's work that it should be asked to take action on a final document on appropriations on the very last morning of the General Assembly.

5. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that he agreed completely with the representative of the United Kingdom. It seemed to him, also, that the failure to include in the Committee's draft report a statement of all the financial implications of recommendations made by the Fifth Committee represented a serious lacuna in the Committee's work which he hoped that the Secretariat would remedy in the future.

6. Mr. DUVAL (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division), replying to the representative of the Netherlands, said that a breakdown of statements of programme budget implications and revised estimates and the amounts consequently drawn from the contingency fund was not usually included in the Fifth Committee's report; it was, however, contained in a separate

document, in the present case document A/C.5/47/85. The sections of the draft report referring to decisions concerning deferrals would, of course, have to be revised in the light of the decisions taken at the Fifth Committee's 52nd meeting, as the representative of the Netherlands had pointed out; that would be done by the Secretariat in due course.

7. Replying to the representative of the United Kingdom, he said that the sole reason for the submission of the draft report at such a late date was the effect on the Fifth Committee's decision-making process of the scheduling of decisions in the other Main Committees of the General Assembly.

8. Replying to the Japanese representative, he said that, although the Committee's draft report contained only a summary of the financial implications of its decisions, those implications were reported to the Assembly in their entirety in the statements of programme budget implications submitted separately to the plenary Assembly in connection with the reports of the other Main Committees.

9. Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands) said it would be helpful to add a third paragraph to part C of draft resolution II giving the final figure for the total amount of the assessment on Member States for the year 1993.

10. Mr BAUDOT (Acting Controller) said that the suggestion was a good one and if it was not done in the case of the current resolution it would certainly be done in the future.

11. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution I without a vote.

12. It was so decided.

13. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution II without a vote.

14. It was so decided.

15. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt its draft report (A/C.5/47/L.20) without a vote.

16. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 111: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/C.5/47/L.22)

17. The CHAIRMAN suggested, on the basis of the informal consultations of the previous night, that action on draft resolution A/C.5/47/L.22 should be deferred, together with other unfinished business under agenda item 111, until the resumed session.

18. It was so decided.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 111 for the first part of the current session, and requested the Rapporteur to report thereon directly to the General Assembly.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

20. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work for the first part of the forty-seventh session.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.